

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of industrial medicine and surgery section of the American Medical Association, urging the appropriation of \$1,500,000 under direction of United States Public Health Service for investigation of causes, modes of transmission, prevention, and cure available to July 1, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees, against Representative Goon's amendment of July 9 to Nolan minimum-wage bill for Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of C. D. Huyler and others, of New York City, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, candy, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, for the abolition of the office of Comptroller of Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of residents of Carbon County, Pa., for repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of East Tennessee Packing Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., protesting against the Kendrick bill (S. 2199) and the Kenyon bill (S. 2202) relating to the meat packing and shipping; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Crawford, Colo., protesting against any amendment or change being made in the present war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of the Lithuanian Alliance of Rumford, Me., requesting the United States Government to compel Poland to withdraw her army from the Lithuanian territories, and that all assistance be denied to Poland as long as she continues to occupy the invaded territories; also requesting the United States to recognize the present Lithuanian Government and to render it moral and material assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES: Petitions of Charles H. Besley & Co., Chicago; A. S. Brown, Waukegan; and National Office Supply Co., of Zion City, all in the State of Illinois, urging an efficient prohibition enforcement code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chicago Malt & Liquor Co., urging that war-time prohibition should be rescinded or that the liquor interests be compensated for loss of property, because "The Government has been our partner and has profited more largely than any of us engaged in it"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John A. Berry and others, of Chicago, Ill., asking for an increase of \$5 per diem for inspectors of customs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to the mount of Thy law with every law that we would write upon our statute books. We can find the conscience of men but by the sanctions of the Divine will revealed to men. We pray Thee to write Thy laws in our hearts that we may form a covenant with God and conform our lives and pattern and shape our national plans according to the vision that Thou hast given to men upon the Mount. Hear us to-day and guide us by Thy holy counsel. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ASHURST and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, praying for the abolishment of the office of Comptroller of the Currency, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a memorial of the Young Men's Tri Mu class of the First Baptist Church of Topeka, Kans., and a memorial of the Good Citizenship Committee of Lawrence, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal or modification of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Southwestern Interstate Coal Operators' Association, of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the adoption of universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Newton, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Goessel, Kans., remonstrating against the adoption of universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for an investigation into the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 90, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers, of Topeka, Kans., praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE. I present a resolution adopted by the League of Free Nations Association, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the League of Free Nations Association in accordance with a referendum of its full membership, calls upon all forward-looking citizens to urge the United States Senate:

1. To ratify without reservations the treaty with Germany, including the league of nations covenant.

Such ratification would establish immediate peace, the world's most urgent need in the interest of order and progress; would abolish many international injustices which have proved prolific causes of war, and would create an agency for the rectification of remaining injustices and for the establishment of mutually advantageous and just relations between nations.

2. To accompany its ratification with a resolution, declaring it to be the purpose of the United States, as a member of the league of nations to:

(a) Press for the immediate restoration of Kiao-Chau and the German concessions in Shantung to the Chinese Republic.

(b) Hold that nothing in the treaty or the covenant shall be continued as authorizing interference by the league in internal revolutions; or as preventing genuine redress and readjustment of boundaries, through orderly processes provided by the league, at any time in the future that these may be demanded by the welfare and manifest interest of the people concerned.

(c) Call for the inclusion of Germany in the council of the league as soon as the new republic shall have entered in good faith upon carrying out the treaty provisions; for the inclusion of Russia as soon as the Russian people establish stable government; and for the full participation of both Germany and Russia on equal footing in all economic intercourse as the best insurance against any reversion to the old scheme of balance of power, economic privilege and war.

(d) Press for the progressive reduction of armaments by all nations.

(e) Throw its whole weight in behalf of such changes in the constitution and such developments in the practice of the league as will make it more democratic in its scheme of representation, its procedure more legislative and less exclusively diplomatic an instrument of growth invigorated and molded by the active, democratic forces of the progressive nations.

JAMES G. McDONALD,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Worcester, Mass., relative to the just claims of Italy, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a public meeting of the Massachusetts branch of the League for Permanent Peace, at Boston, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a communication from the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League, inclosing a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the league, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. I ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS TUBERCULOSIS LEAGUE,
Boston, June 30, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: This letter is written on behalf of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League for the purpose of urging you to use your influence to secure the veto of the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which is now in the hands of the President.

At its meeting on June 27 the committee unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League has always advocated the use of a maximum amount of sunlight and fresh air as a means of prevention and cure of tuberculosis; and

"Whereas the said league considers the present daylight-saving law an aid in preserving the general health of the country, and in particular a great help in the prevention of tuberculosis: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League views with concern the present effort to do away with the daylight-saving law, and hereby urges the President to veto the repealer now in his hands."

"VINCENT Y. BOWDITCH, M. D.,

"EDWARD O. OTIS, M. D.,

"ROGER I. LEE, M. D.,

"DONALD B. ARMSTRONG, M. D.,

"VANDERPOEL ADRIANCE, M. D.,

"GEORGE L. SCHATZ, M. D.,

"MISS LOUISA P. LORING."

"Executive Committee."

Earnestly hoping that you will take any action which may seem to you to be possible and expedient under the circumstances, I am,
Respectfully, yours,

R. V. SPENCER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a petition signed by Charles H. Cole, formerly brigadier general, Fifty-second Infantry Brigade, by Lieut. Col. Hugh Cabot, Royal Army, Medical Corps, British Expeditionary Force, and other Massachusetts officers who fought in the war with Germany, urging the ratification of the treaty of peace. I move that the petition be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions from employees of the Boston Rubber Shoe Co., of Malden; of Nichols & Gilpin, of Haverhill; of the Danvers Iron Works; of John Roberts Sons Co.; of Thomas H. Arnold; of Ackerman & Brummell, of Boston; of the Desmond Publishing Co.; of the Hamilton Woolen Co., of Southbridge; of the Massachusetts Mohair Plush Co., of Lowell; of the A. M. Eaton Paper Co., of Roxbury; of the Linen Thread Co. of Massachusetts, of North Grafton; of the Bolton Worsted Mills (Inc.), of Methuen; of Fred S. High, of Boston; of the United States Electric Signal Co., of Newton; of Seamans & Cobb Co., of Boston; of the Spaulding & Tewksbury Co.; of C. Stohn, of Hyde Park; of George P. Batchelder, of Lynn; of the Worcester Pressed Steel Co.; of the Merrimac Mills, of Methuen; of Jonah & George, of Merrimac; of the Boston Bridge Works (Inc.); of the New England Branch of the Thread Agency; of D. Mackintosh & Sons Co., of Holyoke; of the Stickney & Poor Spice Co., of Boston; of the Lawrence Pump & Engine Co.; of the Motor Specialties Co., of Waltham; of the Yale Novelty Co., of Leominster; of the Wireless Specialty Apparatus Co., of Boston; of the Reading Manufacturing Co.; of the S. B. Condit, Jr., Co.; of Kenny Bros. & Wolkins; of Peter Gray & Sons (Inc.), of Boston; of the H. M. Hillson Co., of Somerville; of the Hampden Lumber Co., of Springfield; of Grimes & Harris, of Leominster; of the United States Envelope Co., of Worcester; of the Direct Importing Co.; of the Lumsden & Van Stone Co.; of the F. H. Pilsen Co., of Boston; of the Can Fastener Co., of Cambridge; and of Godfrey L. Cabot and sundry other citizens of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the establishment of a budget system for the Government, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Republic Club, of Compton; of the Parent Teachers' Association, of Norwalk; of Martin Severence Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Pasadena; of Silver Wave Rebekah Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Santa Monica; of Burnaby Lodge, No. 194, Order Sons of St. George, of San Francisco; of the Ministers' Union of San Francisco Bay Region, of Oakland; and of the Board of Christian Education, Diocese of Los Angeles, of Santa Monica, all in the State of California, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Portland, South Portland, and Stonington, all in the State of Maine, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Butterfield, Minn., remonstrating against the adoption of universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against sustaining the President's veto of the so-called daylight-saving provision in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of the Florida State Horticultural Society, of Gainesville, Fla., remonstrating against the restriction of immigration from the Bahama Islands and West Indies into Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Kiwanis Club, of Pensacola, Fla., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for an equitable adjustment of export and import freight rates, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the City Commission of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the erection of a new post-office building in that city, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the City Commission of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the construction of a canal from that city to the St. Johns River, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Buckeystown, Md., remonstrating against the repeal or modification of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Smithburg, Highfield, and Lantz, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for an investigation into the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Independence, of sundry citizens of Clearwater and La Harpe, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of voters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church and of the Council of St. Norbert, No. 134, L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, of West Rutland, Vt., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Colchester, Winooski Falls, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 85) thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 1726) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 86) thereon.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1369) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 87) thereon.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 120, submitted by Mr. SHERMAN on the 14th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and such other expert assistants as may be necessary; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXPORTS OF MEAT PRODUCTS.

Mr. LODGE. I report favorably without amendment from the Committee on Foreign Relations the following resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 114) submitted by Mr. SHERMAN on the 10th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate, at the earliest possible moment, copies of all documents, correspondence, or other papers in its possession relating to its efforts or action in promotion or concerning the ex-

port trade in meats from the United States to the Kingdom of Great Britain or any of its colonial dependencies and other countries, and especially any communications by the Federal Trade Commission, or any of its members, officers, agents, or employees with the officers or agents of any foreign Government, and more especially all communications had with the Ministry of Reconstruction of Great Britain or the members thereof appointed in 1918, and to include all correspondence with the Hon. Charles A. McCurdy, Member of Parliament, of the Ministry of Foods and recently chairman of the committee on trusts, also such correspondence with any other member of the Ministry of Reconstruction in relation to the meat industries of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KENYON. I do not rise to object, but merely to ask what the Senator expects the correspondence to show?

Mr. LODGE. I ask the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. The Senator from Illinois introduced the resolution which has just been reported favorably from the committee. The committee reported it without amendment and unanimously. The purpose of the resolution appeared to the committee to be simply to get certain facts in regard to the export of meat products. We saw no reason why the Senate should not have the information.

Mr. KENYON. I realize that there is a propaganda on hand to discredit the Federal Trade Commission and its findings as to the meat industry, and I am anxious to know what the Senator, in a general way, expects to show by the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator suggest that the Committee on Foreign Relations are engaged in such a propaganda?

Mr. KENYON. Not at all, but the Committee on Foreign Relations may not know everything that is going on.

Mr. LODGE. This is a request for information for certain statistics or certain correspondence.

Mr. KENYON. It comes at a time very close to the report of the Federal Trade Commission as to the packers, and it somewhat arouses my suspicions.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will be glad to inform the Senator of anything I have in mind. I have a letter in my possession dated July 7, 1919, from W. B. Colver, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Colver says:

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 27, at page 1985, your remarks are quoted as follows:

"Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Does he know who the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission is now?"

"Mr. POMERENE. I think Mr. Colver is the chairman now."

"Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know where he is at this time?"

"Mr. POMERENE. I do not; I am not my brother's keeper in that respect."

"Mr. SHERMAN. I am not his keeper either, but I believe I have some accurate information about where he is. Unless he has returned recently, he is in England. When the Senator speaks of the fostering care of the Federal Trade Commission on our export trade, I will say that I believe I will have adequate proof to present here that, instead of promoting our export trade, he is destroying it in England by unfriendly comments, by violent speeches reported in English newspapers denouncing certain of our export lines. I think he is paying his traveling expenses across the ocean out of such appropriations as this."

That is the quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He continues in this manner:

I have not had the opportunity to read the RECORD closely every day, and I may have overlooked your presentation of "adequate proof."

If I have, will you be so good as to cite me to the page of the RECORD, and if you have not presented your proof will you advise me when you do so?

That was the letter. I have some proof in my possession, but there is other proof, I think, that can be furnished by the Federal Trade Commission, its members, or some of its employees. It is that that I seek to have. The resolution asks for the information.

I believe that Mr. Colver if not others of the Federal Trade Commission have communicated very unfriendly information to the British authorities, those who are capable of injuring our export trade. If there is nothing of that kind in these records, then the adoption of the resolution will show nothing, of course, and will not be harmful nor will it afford me any information in answering the questions propounded in this letter of Mr. Colver.

I wish the resolution adopted to the end that if there is anything that can be made public in their correspondence with the English authorities that would discourage or tend to discourage the export trade from this country I be given it.

I will say further, Mr. President, I have a considerable volume of information which will tend and some of it will directly show that what I said as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is true. For instance, I have clippings from certain of the London newspapers. I have one from the London Star of April 14, 1919, containing an interview from Mr. Colver. So far as I said he had used violent speeches I am not correct; that is an inaccuracy and I am ready now to make, so far as my present information goes, the correction. But this interview of the 14th of April, in the London Star, is a very hurtful

interview. It has a direct tendency not only to damage the export trade but to entirely put the packers of this country out of the British market, not only in England but in all the United Kingdom, and if it is done there naturally the colonial dependencies would probably take the same course.

I wish particularly Mr. Colver or any agent or employee or other member or officer of the Federal Trade Commission to say whether they have had any correspondence along the lines covered in that interview. The interview is enough to establish the truth of the statement I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the first opportunity I have had to refer to it. This is as follows:

Many people in Smithfield (says a Star correspondent) have been puzzled by the mysterious disappearance from the American meat trust of the firm of Sulzberger & Sons, and the sudden appearance of a new company called Wilson & Co.

Sulzbergers had large dealings with this country, carried out through their agents, Archer & Co., and the story has never been told. It is now revealed in the latest volume of evidence taken by the United States Federal Trade Commission, whose chairman, the Hon. W. B. Colver, has been interviewed in London by a Star representative.

Then follows quite a large matter of alleged statement of fact. I do not care to go into it now because of the time.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask if the Senator is reading from the interview with Mr. Colver?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; it purports to be an interview with Mr. Colver.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator read any part of the interview?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not.

Mr. KENYON. What, then, was the Senator reading?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am reading, so far, the heading of the interview, and then follows what purports to be this interview.

Mr. KENYON. From what paper is it?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is from the London Star of April 14, 1919. It is not, I will say, a quotation-mark interview. It states that the reporter of the London Star had an interview with W. B. Colver, and then follow a number of statements about how the firm of Sulzberger & Sons disappeared from the packing business.

I wish to say that, taking the whole of it, this statement is grossly vicious, unfair, and some of it is false.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know that it is an authentic interview with Mr. Colver?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have clipped it from the London Star.

Mr. KENYON. Where does the Senator get the paper?

Mr. SHERMAN. You can get it in the Congressional Library. You will find the original on file there.

Mr. BORAH. Is there any objection to the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is just waiting to see.

Mr. BORAH. I asked for the reason that if there is objection to it, I prefer that we proceed with morning business.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would much prefer that course myself. I was only trying to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I was simply trying to find out about the resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not care to take it up at this time if there is any objection.

Mr. KENYON. Senators are being flooded now with telegrams. There is a general movement in this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The resolution is before the Senate. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

JAPANESE CONTROL OF SHANTUNG.

Mr. BORAH. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 116, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. BORAH on the 10th instant, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate a copy of any letter or written protest by any member or members of the American peace commission against the disposition or adjustment which was made with reference to Shantung, and particularly a copy of a letter written by Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, member of the peace commission, on behalf of himself, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, and Hon. Henry White, members of the peace commission, protesting against the provisions of the treaty with reference to Shantung.

Any memoranda or other information in the possession of the American peace commission or any member thereof with reference to the attempt of Japan or her peace delegates to intimidate the Chinese peace delegates, and to control the action of said Chinese delegates through and by means of intimidation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator from Idaho to let the resolution go over. I object to its consideration. I think the Senator is willing to have it go over.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, if the Senator requests it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Edward Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2470) granting a pension to John B. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2471) for the garnishment and attachment of the wages of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2473) for the relief of homestead claimants in drought-stricken regions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2474) to amend the war-risk insurance act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Alvin A. Noyes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 2476) to amend the act establishing the eastern district of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2477) for the relief of Henry E. Davies (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2478) granting an increase of pension to Harry Colpus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 2479) granting a pension to Nannie M. Franks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2480) granting a pension to Henry Carroll (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2481) granting a pension to Ellen Merritt;

A bill (S. 2482) granting an increase of pension to Barbara A. Munger (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Sill (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2484) granting an increase of pension to Frank Crith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2485) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Oliver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2486) granting a pension to Margaret I. Halbert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2487) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Reeser (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 2488) for the relief of the estate of Gen. Luther P. Bradley; and

A bill (S. 2489) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of Robert Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2490) granting an increase of pension to James C. Metlin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 2491) granting a pension to Paul Stanley Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2492) to encourage home ownership and to stimulate the buying and building of homes; to create a standard form of investment based on building-association mortgages; to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States; to furnish a market for Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 2493) to extend the provisions of the war-risk insurance act of September 2, 1914, as amended, to cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2494) to transfer the tract of land known as the Lighthouse Reservation, at North Point, Md., from the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce to the jurisdiction of the War Department;

A bill (S. 2495) transferring the tract of land known as Craney Island from the jurisdiction of the War Department to the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department and transferring the tract of land known as Fishermans Island from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the jurisdiction of the War Department;

A bill (S. 2496) authorizing the retirement of members of the Army Nurse Corps (female); and

A bill (S. 2497) to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ALLEGED UNLAWFUL PRACTICES OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Whereas charges of unlawful practices have been made against certain officials in the Department of Justice and against the United States district attorney for Kansas, and other Federal officials in that State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the said charges of unlawful and illegal practices committed by certain officials of the Department of Justice, the United States district attorney for Kansas, and other Federal officials in that State; that the said committee report in full to the Senate the findings on such hearings; and be it

Resolved further, That the expenses incurred in the carrying out of this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers ordered by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, and approved by the chairman of the committee.

TRANSFER OF SHANTUNG TO JAPAN.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 122), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate does not advise and does not consent to that article of the pending proposed treaty with Germany, China, Japan, and other nations by which Shantung, a part of China, is transferred to the jurisdiction of Japan.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an address by George Wharton Pepper before the New Jersey Bar Association in Atlantic City, June 14, 1919, on the executive control of international affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE CONTROL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.

[Address of George Wharton Pepper before the New Jersey Bar Association in Atlantic City, June 14, 1919.]

I.

"If the covenant of the league of nations becomes operative in its present form, great power and correspondingly great responsibility will be cast upon nine men. Of these nine, one will be a Briton, one a Frenchman, one an Italian, one a Japanese, and one an American. At least for the time being the group will include a Belgian, a Brazilian, a Greek, and a Spaniard. Collectively these nine men will assemble as the executive council of the league. Severally they will purport to represent their respective nations. It is interesting to visualize this composite group and to picture them as they sit at a round table in Geneva. They may deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world."

"It is not only interesting but highly important for lawyers to determine what the precise function of this group will be within the broad field thus assigned to it. Laymen may be content to affirm or deny that the league sets up a central government or a superstate. Lawyers, however, will not be satisfied until they understand the substance of the matter, irrespective of the terms used to describe it."

"If and when the council meets, each represented nation will in some manner have chosen its delegates. Some one will claim a seat as the representative of the United States of America. When votes are cast in council there will be no limit to the significance attaching to them. The representative of the United States will in effect hold the proxy of this Nation. When he votes he records the decision of 100,000,000 people. Whether, consistently with the Constitution of the United States, the power thus to vote on behalf of the Nation can be conferred on anybody is a constitutional question which I do not

propose to discuss. I raise the more fundamental question whether the principle of representative action can in fact be so extended as to clothe one man with the uncontrolled authority to commit 100,000,000.

"If the executive council of the league was limited in function to advisory action, the question of representation would still be important. If, as I shall presently show, the vote of the council may actually bind member States in great international emergencies, then the reality of representation becomes not merely important but vital. The aim of the league is to keep the peace of the world after the world shall have made peace. Few things are more likely to breathe discord and precipitate war than the attempt to hold a great nation to a position marked out for it by the action of a single individual, no matter how wise or how trustworthy.

"It is difficult to discuss current international events without seeming to criticize individual statesmen. And yet it can not be wise to shut our eyes and to seal our lips in the presence of object lessons from which there is much to learn.

"With this thought in mind, and solely in connection with the point I am discussing, I direct your attention to what I believe to be one of the most fruitful sources of discord in the United States, and therefore in the world, to-day. I refer to the fact that in regard to matters of world concern the President of the United States has assumed what I believe to be the absolutely impossible task of interpreting and expressing the mind and will of his fellow countrymen.

"There is much heated debate respecting the President's wisdom or unwisdom in declining to seek the advice of the Senate. Without controversy, this at least may be said, that when the Senate and the President act together the people have some check upon solitary Executive action. It may not be a sufficient check. It may not be the wisest kind of a check. But until a better is devised and applied few lawyers will deny that the cooperation of the executive and the legislative departments of the Government is a great safeguard against the kind of solitary Executive action which in extreme cases tends to revolution.

"Senators have lately been engaging in a technical discussion as to whether the draft of a treaty should be made public while it is in process of negotiation. It seems to me that they lose sight of the point which is vital in the present situation, namely, that the so-called negotiation is not being conducted by commissioners who will in due time report to the Executive, who, in his turn, will submit the product of negotiation to the Senate, but by the Chief Executive himself, whose every act and every utterance must necessarily be interpreted as so far committing the Nation that a Senator who ventures to speak out is branded as one who is embarrassing the President and a citizen who ventures to protest must submit to charges of disloyalty. For such a situation we have no precedent in our constitutional history. The question is not whether the President acts wisely when he makes himself a commissioner. The point is that if and when the Chief Executive acts as a commissioner he must either consult with the legislative department at each step of the negotiation or arouse the spirit of discord which is always bred when multitudes of people question the reality of the representation by which they are sought to be bound.

"I call this a contemporary object-lesson, because we are asked to incorporate permanently in the structure of a peace league a theory of representative action which at the present moment is producing grave internal dissatisfaction throughout the country. If our representative in the executive council is appointed by the President alone, the danger will reach its maximum. But if he is chosen by the Congress, or even by popular vote, he will still be placed in an impossible position with his own constituents the very first time a great world question comes before the council for decision. When he undertakes to tell the council and the world how the United States votes on the question at issue he will necessarily arouse the resentment and even the passion of millions of our own people. If one man can express the mind and will of this Nation, why do we have a Congress and a Supreme Court? Why not elect the President by direct popular vote and intrust to him and to his Cabinet the permanent control of all national interests?

"What I have said is intended to direct your attention to the probable effect on Americans of action taken in council by the unfortunate person who is called upon to discharge an impossible duty. What will be the effect of councilor action upon the 36 nations not even nominally represented in the council it is not very difficult to predict.

"This league is not worth while unless it is to be a peace league. It will not prove to be a peace league if the people of member States are constantly thrown into discord and dissension by the well-meant but futile efforts of single individuals

to express the national will. It will not prove to be a peace league if States not represented in the council find themselves from time to time committed by the votes of a central authority over which they have not even a nominal control or influence.

II.

"I come now to the proposition referred to a moment ago—that this central group of nine men are in fact given by the covenant the power in every great international emergency to determine the policy and conduct of member States.

"It can not successfully be denied that each league member is bound by covenant to submit to this council of nine all serious disputes of any and every kind which the parties do not unite in arbitrating. Nor can it be denied that in a certain contingency the nation against whom the council decides is bound not to go to war with the successful disputant. The contingency in which a sovereign State is thus bound is that in which there is a unanimous verdict against it by the members of the council not parties to the dispute.

"I pause to note a point often overlooked. It is this, that when nations agree with respect to all manner of future disputes to be bound by the vote of other nations, they are creating a central authority invested with sovereign powers. Whether this central organization shall or shall not be called a 'superstate' is purely a matter of definition.

"The important fact is that when such a system is set up member States have thereby abdicated their right to determine their own course in multitudes of emergencies and have conferred that right upon a body created for the purpose.

"It makes no difference, as a matter of principle, whether the verdict by which a nation is to be bound must be given unanimously by other nations or whether a bare majority vote will suffice. The important point is that when once the action of one nation can be determined by the vote of other nations the line has been crossed which separates diplomatic conference from governmental action. Each member has suffered itself to be built into the structure of a larger governmental concern, much as a kingdom is built into the structure of an empire.

"The international agreement to arbitrate a particular question or a particular class of questions obviously stands on a different basis. The plan embodied in the covenant contemplates the decision by the central body of all questions on all subjects and at all times. The covenant makes it the specific duty of the council to deal with disputes which the parties do not recognize as suitable for arbitration. In other words, the jurisdiction of the council begins where the possibility of arbitration ends.

"Some of the confusion of thought on this subject betrayed by advocates of the league has been due to the fact that the provisions of the covenant creating the central government are expressed in eighteenth century terms of social contract. The fiction of a promise to act in accordance with the central decision is substituted for the language of compulsion. But the consequences are the same. It would be entirely possible to rewrite the Constitution of the United States in terms of social contract. Instead of enumerating the powers of Congress the framers might have drafted a covenant by citizens and States to submit themselves to such action as Congress might take. A breach of the covenant would be an act of lawlessness and prescribed consequences would follow.

"In the case of the league these consequences are sufficiently serious.

"Let it be supposed that the United States and Japan are parties to a dispute over the validity of our immigration policy and that the matter has been referred to the council. Let it further be supposed that the other seven nations in council, against our protest, have decided that this is not a matter purely within our domestic jurisdiction and on the merits of the question have decided against us and in favor of Japan. Let it likewise be supposed that the Mikado thereupon sends a shipload of subjects to San Francisco under battleship convoy and attempts to land them. The United States is bound by its covenant not to go to war against the successful disputant. But let us imagine that the instinct of self-preservation is too strong for us and that we are smarting under a sense of injustice. We fire on the Japanese ships, prevent the landing, and precipitate war.

"What follows?

"The answer given by article 16 is that this act of war on our part against Japan is an act of war against all league members. Instantly each member State becomes bound to subject the United States to a social, commercial, and economic boycott of the most pitiless sort, and it becomes the duty of the council to recommend to the several Governments the military

and naval quotas to be contributed by each 'to protect the covenants' i. e., to enforce the decrees of the league.

"Nobody doubts but that such a situation as I have supposed would be disastrous to the United States. The most that an advocate of the league can say is that this precise situation will not arise. Perhaps not. But history is full of such situations and history has a way of repeating itself. Why should we take so great a chance when the essential value of the league can be preserved by amputating these political excrescences?

"It is to be noted also that there is a financial aspect of situations like the one just suggested. The cost of any war precipitated by a breach of covenant is underwritten by all league members. The United States, under article 16, must contribute a large part of the financing of a distant war in which we may have only a remote concern.

"I have said that there is no international dispute of any kind which may not be dealt with by the council. Among other purely political or nonjusticiable matters the council may determine the following:

"First. Whether a protest by the United States under the Monroe doctrine tends to the maintenance of peace and, if not, may bind us by a decision that the protest is invalid and may safely be disregarded by our adversary.

"Second. Whether a given matter (such as immigration, coastwise trade, protective tariff, status of the Panama Canal) is or is not of purely domestic jurisdiction and, if not, may make a binding decree against us on the merits of the question raised by our adversary.

"Third. Whether the United States has properly discharged its duties as mandatory for some weaker nation, and, if not, to what extent we shall be surcharged.

"Fourth. Whether in any case involving sovereign and national self-determination we are right or wrong in the position we have taken, and what course of conduct the other nation may pursue toward us with the sanction and support of the league and in view of our covenant not to resort to war.

"If the foregoing analysis is correct, three points will have been made clear:

"First. That the league of nations has as its central agency a voting trust of nine nations dominated by five.

"Second. That the voting trustees who act for the several nations have power to decide great and vital questions of national self-interest for member States and to bind them by their decision.

"Third. That while an American is to be one of nine delegates in the council it is from the nature of things impossible that he can express the mind and will of his fellow countrymen otherwise than by a representation which is merely fictional.

III.

"My next point is that the central governmental agency thus set up by the covenant must in all cases resort to executive action rather than to legislative or judicial action and will by so doing produce world-wide discontent, friction, and war.

"In the last analysis every organized government must place its main reliance upon a legislature, a court, or an executive.

"England trusts Parliament, and Parliament has proved the palladium of English liberties.

"We in the United States have learned that the success of our constitutional experiment has resulted from the vesting of judicial power in the Supreme Court.

"Germany trusted the executive, and, as always, executive action quickly lapsed into tyranny. The Kaiser was nothing more than the embodiment of a primitive governmental conception, an unhampered executive with a little court and an embryonic legislature to play with. Given these conditions, everything that followed was a matter of course.

"The covenant of the league of nations sets up a central governmental agency which is the executive raised to its highest power. The so-called assembly is a clumsy and superfluous institution. One doubts whether it will ever meet. If it does, and if it undertakes to decide disputes referred to it by the council or by a party, the principle of majority rule in international affairs will become even more obvious than in the council, for a decision of the assembly becomes binding if made by the nations represented in the council supplemented by a bare majority of the rest—19 out of 36, of which 19 votes Great Britain will cast 5.

"It is not too much to ask that lawyers will consider carefully what it means thus wholly to subordinate the legislative and the judicial function to the executive. In war times, in the interest of strong and vigorous rather than of just and acceptable action, we were willing to make large delegations of authority to the executive. I doubt, however, whether any

calm political thinker in America will advocate the indefinite prolongation of this system of executive control for our own affairs, let alone for the affairs of the world. Yet the covenant of the league proposes to perpetuate for the world and under normal conditions such a predominance of the executive function as will turn peace into war even more certainly than it can crown war with victory.

"The fact that there are nine executives rather than one is not material. Four of them are confessedly negligible, and are treated as such. Of the other five, four will represent the powers that dominated the peace conference. Of these four, three have actually been in the assembly. Among the three at any given time the position of commanding influence will be accorded to one.

"What is really proposed is that we should vest executive, legislative, and judicial power for the government of the world in a voting trusteeship dominated by two or three men.

"What we are actually contemplating is an offensive and defensive political alliance for the permanent control of international affairs, coupled with a liberal guaranty of American force to make the alliance effective and a pledge of American capital to finance the wars of the world.

IV.

"An effective way to test the soundness of the foregoing analysis is to inquire whether those who are responsible for the league will consent to the amendments necessary to meet the objections which have here been raised.

"Three simple amendments would suffice to transform this league from a war league into a peace league. If these amendments are refused, the refusal goes a long way toward proving that the determination to set up a strong international government is of the essence of the plan.

"The three amendments are these:

"First. Strike out the covenant which now binds member States to accept the action of the council or assembly and by striking them out transform those bodies into useful international councils of conciliation.

"Second. Create a court of international justice with a compulsory jurisdiction over all justiciable disputes.

"Third. Eliminate from the covenant the blanket guaranties of article 10 and incorporate in the treaty such definite and specific guaranties by the United States and other league members as are requisite to make the treaty settlements actually effective.

"It will not do to refuse to make amendments on the ground that the evils at which they are aimed do not exist. The answer is that multitudes of wise, intelligent, and patriotic citizens actually perceive these grave elements of danger in the document. No group of men should indulge pride of intellect to the extent of declaring that there is only one side to the questions which I have been discussing. The alleged mechanical difficulties in the way of making amendments are purely imaginary. The document can readily be amended if people are in earnest about it.

"A refusal to agree to these amendments is inconsistent with a sincere belief in free government and is consistent only with a settled determination to establish and maintain a centralized executive control of world affairs."

ADDRESS BY THOMAS PATTERSON.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask that an address by Thomas Patterson, of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) bar, one of the leading lawyers of Pennsylvania, giving a summary of the league of nations, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[By Thomas Patterson, Esq., of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Bar.]

"What is known as government by organic law—that is, government under a fixed constitution to which legislation must conform—is a matter of comparatively recent date and limited area. Until within recent years all governments, of whatever form, were entirely free to act in accordance with their pleasure as the occasion arose. While they often called important legislation constitutional legislation, yet, in fact, such legislation could be changed at any moment by act of parliament or legislature in the usual method.

"The idea of constitutional restriction probably had its rise in the royal charters of the American colonies. In some of those charters there were contained provisions which prohibited legislation on certain subjects, or provided that certain tenures should be established or customs adopted which the colonial legislature could not change. This idea took larger shape, involving the fundamental union of different colonies, in the Albany

convention of 1763, and later in the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution of the United States.

"In the history which has been made under the latter instrument, we get most of our knowledge of the practical working result of an organic instrument binding together a number of units, over which a central power, created and limited by the Constitution which is the basis of the Union, exercises authority.

"One of the first points to be noted about this constitutional history is that the character and effect of the Constitution as discussed by statesmen at the time of its adoption is entirely different from its character and effect as worked out through judicial decisions and in political history. Originally the Constitution was regarded as a mere league, interfering with the sovereignty of the several States only to the extent that those States had clearly given up specific rights. All powers not given directly or by necessary implication remained with the States.

"When the Constitution came up for adoption by the Virginia convention, Patrick Henry very strongly opposed it, because Virginia, then by far the largest and richest of the colonies, was yielding her independence to some unknown sovereignty, which might later on reduce her to a passive or subject condition, and in support of his argument he called attention to the opening line of the preamble of the Constitution, 'We, the people of the United States.' He was at once answered by James Madison, who had been a member of the constitutional convention, and who said that the words had no meaning, except that, as the framers of the instrument did not know the States which were to sign the agreement, they could not name the States, but they used the term in the sense of 'the people of the States united by this Constitution.' He further said that a most superficial inspection of the document showed that it was entirely a Union of the States and executed in the nature of a treaty in their capacity as States. If it were a Union of the people, the people of the States would decide by a vote of all the people of the States whether to adopt or reject it. The representation in the Senate was by States and amendment to the instrument could only be made by States.

"This argument prevailed. Virginia approved the instrument. Later on the constitutional lawyers of the North—Webster, Marshall, and Story—took precisely the position which Patrick Henry had indicated, that the Union was of the people and not of the States, and that secession, therefore, was illegal, because the Union was not a federation between the States, but an instrument adopted by the people of the States, and a Union of the people and not of communities.

"The answer of the southern lawyers, along the lines which Madison had already indicated in his speech to the Virginia convention, may well be regarded as the better legal argument. The point to be especially noticed, however, is that it was not a question of what was intended by the framers of the Constitution or the people who adopted it, nor what was the logical and legal construction of its various phrases, but the fact that the Constitution had placed the supreme power in the Federal Government; that it had given it control of the Army and Navy, the mint, the post office, and the other elements of national life. It had denied the States all of these rights and prohibited them from maintaining any standing army or from negotiating any treaty between the different States, so that when the Southern States made their desperate effort to tear loose from a Union which had become obnoxious to them they found themselves confronted not by the arguments of lawyers showing that their act was illegal, but by the overwhelming national force opposed to them, and, in spite of their determined and courageous efforts, they were fated to defeat from the start. After the Navy of the United States had laid its strangle hold upon the southern ports, preventing all commerce from entering or departing from those States, the fact that it must before a great while perish was absolutely determined.

"Far from criticizing our Constitution, I think that even the forces once opposed to it would concede that its preservation had been most beneficial, but we see by this incident the results which follow failure to clearly define both purpose and power, in both which respects our Constitution is incomparably clearer than the covenants of the league.

"So we may note that it was not what Madison or Henry or others who argued for or against the Constitution said it would mean that counted at all in the history of the matter, but it was the actual disposition of the powers and the creation of a paramount central authority which determined the result of the controversy.

"Another matter of interest to be noted is that the tendency of the Federal Government has always been toward the extension of its powers. This has not only been accomplished by a course of decision of the Supreme Court, which has naturally enough sought to weld the various State elements into a unified

whole, but the course of public thought, of legislation, and of amendment has been one to steadily increase the powers of the Central Government and reduce and limit the powers of the local or State governments. So that, looking back, I think we will all agree that the constitutional history has been one of steady but increasing centralization, until the State lines are almost at the point of disappearing. Yet a result such as this was one of the last things that the framers of the Constitution or the people who adopted it thought it possible to happen. It is what the people who act under a Constitution, not the people who theorize a priori think about it, that is determinative. And this has been accomplished under regulation and control by one of the most conservative bodies of the world—the Supreme Court of the United States, who have, beyond question, earnestly sought not to warp nor disturb the meaning of the Constitution, but to try to apply it in an enlightened sense, according to its spirit.

"With such aids as these brief lessons of our own constitutional history have given us, let us examine for a moment the proposed world federation which comes before us with the title of 'the league of nations.'

"The scope and purpose of the Constitution of the United States are very clearly defined. The reason for its being called into existence, as a necessary protective measure against destruction by the great European powers, also serves sharply to define and make clear its real intent.

"In the case of the league of nations we are at a loss to find any definition that can be laid down so as to give us any accurate limitation of the field of jurisdiction of the proposed federation. We know that international peace is not its sole object. We have, also, 'international cooperation,' whatever that may mean. We know, again, that the assembly, which is its paramount body, 'may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.' What this sphere of action may be, outside the peace of the world and outside international cooperation, whatever the latter term may mean, we are left in doubt, except that we find among the general objects the securing of harmonious conditions of labor, and for this purpose the establishment and maintenance of international organizations; the just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under the control of the league; supervision over the execution of agreements in regard to certain prohibited traffics and trade in arms; freedom of communication and transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all the members of the league. It would seem quite apparent that, with so general and vague an outline or description of the field of operations of the league, that field of operations may, in fact, include almost anything in which, for the time being, the nations of the world, or some of them, may be thought to have an interest.

"It is also important to note that the ordinary division into executive, legislative, and judicial powers, which former constitutions always recognized, is not made here. The ordinary action is by the executive council. Final action lies with the assembly. These bodies, if they act at all, must act by some sort of legislation. If the legislation is to be executed, they must appoint executives to carry it out, and there is no court or judicial body that can declare that such legislation or action is beyond the scope of the powers with which the league is invested. In other words, we have a situation in which the central authority is the sole judge of the limits of its powers and the method by which it will carry them into effect.

"With all history pointing, as it does, toward the increase of power in central authority, even when limited by independent judicial supervision, it seems quite apparent that if the league should become an established fact and should exist throughout the years its tendency would be to steadily increase its autocratic authority, and this course is greatly accentuated in the present case by the entirely vague and loosely formed declarations as to what the scope of authority of the league is intended to be.

"This naturally leads us up to the question of sovereignty. It has been much debated whether or not the authorities of the league could enforce upon unwilling nations its will in matters in which those nations might be unwilling to acquiesce. The answer must be that the league is paramount and supreme within the sphere of activity for which it is created. As noted above, what that sphere is is a matter which the councils of the league must determine, but, whatever it may be, within that sphere the powers of the league must be absolutely supreme. That was the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of the Federal Constitution and must be the ruling of whatever authorities are charged with the execution of the activities of the league. This necessarily follows from the very nature of a constitution. If one of the constituent units may define the

powers of the league and resist its authority, when the sovereignty of the league has been destroyed, then there is an end of the federation. Unless it can speak with authority, it need not speak at all. It does not exist at all for governmental purposes. It would be merely a clearing house, through which the views of nations could be exchanged and action of concerted character decided upon or rejected. And this could be done as well without the league as with it. But more than that, it is perfectly apparent by the relations which the powers of the league are given toward the military establishments in the various units, toward the treaties which are made between those units, toward the punishment of offending nations who refuse to obey its decrees, and the summoning of forces to its aid to carry out the decrees, that the purpose was to create a sovereign power, within the limits of its jurisdiction. As it necessarily must be intended, the league shall be given all necessary power to carry out its edicts or judgments which are to be supreme. Nothing else can be the meaning of such a phrase as that in article 15, referring to the punishment of a covenant-breaking State and the action of the remaining States:

"They (the remaining States) will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory for forces of any of the members of the league which are cooperating to protect the covenants of the league.

"In like manner the provisions as to the trade in arms, the inspection of all munition plants, arms, naval and military programs of the various units, speak the same language.

"Let it be conceded that this is a necessary thing, as has been pointed out. If the league be a league at all, then it must have the power to enforce its decrees, and it must have the authority to determine the scope of its jurisdiction. The purpose plainly exists and the necessary powers are given. If there were nothing else, the language, which is repeated, of protecting the covenants of the league by force, would be conclusive upon this subject.

"I need not recall the argument, which is too well known to need repetition, that it is beyond the constitutional powers of the Senate and the Chief Executive to enter into a covenant which shall surrender any part of the sovereignty of the United States. I am only considering for a moment the practical effect which might happen, and therefore must be regarded as bound to happen, if the United States should become a constituent member of the league. Whether or not our relations with Mexico or with the Orient; our admission of emigrants to citizenship from any of those countries; our relations of trade with them or with Europe were subject matter within the jurisdiction of the league of nations is one on which, doubtless, arguments could be heard, but the decision would rest with the councils of the league. Whatever the conclusion they might reach in any given case would have to become the law governing this country in that matter. If it is answered that a country may withdraw from the league upon two years' notice, the answer is apparent that within those two years infinite damage might be inflicted, and that even with this period of secession given a nation might well be so reduced in its military forces as to be unable to withstand coercion if at the time the rest of the world believed that course was desirable. In addition to that, upon what possible theory should a nation accept obligations and enter into covenants of association and alliance where the only possible answer given to its loss of sovereignty would be that it may, after a period, win free and regain such part of its sovereignty as may not have been permanently affected?

"The reasons put forward for the adoption of the league, or for the entrance of this country into the league, of the smallness of the world, of the cause of humanity, of the horrors of war do not seem to me to touch the question at all. The history of this country has not been one of oppression nor of overarmament nor of seeking quarrels either on this continent or beyond the sea. While we have had wars, with little or no preparation for the war on either side, yet to-day I think it may truly be said that no nation has to build a ship or raise an army or build a fort in preparedness for any aggressive act on the part of the United States. Our 3,000-mile boundary line along Canada with not a fort nor a soldier to mark that line is sufficient evidence of what our history has been in relation to international peace.

"What possible call of humanity is there to lead us to undertake to constitute a part of the police force to guard the other side of the world? Prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe most Americans did not even know the names of many of the nations which became involved in that war or their location or the character of their governments. We can contribute nothing in the way of wise policy, and we certainly ought not to be required to contribute anything in the way of force to limit the boundaries or maintain the integrity or suppress violence among those far-distant peoples. In like manner these peoples, as well

as the larger nations of Europe, ought not to be called upon, and if called upon could not wisely act, in the settlement of disputes which might arise with our neighbors on this continent or in the East.

"It is an old saying that one may not have efficiency without responsibility. If our country is to keep its guardian place in the New World, it must have the full responsibility for its actions. It can not efficiently perform these functions if the nations of the Old World may reach over its shoulders at any time and determine for it the course of action it should pursue or the decision it should reach.

"If there is any single reason for the cause of humanity that we should interfere for the sake of the world's peace, the case would be different, but it is perfectly apparent that the nations of the Old World, gathered together in any league or treaty they may see fit to adopt or enact, can, if they are of united purpose, successfully reduce their armaments and successfully make common cause against any aggressive warfare, so that such aggressive warfare will cease even to be contemplated. But if, unlikely as it may be, the cause of humanity ever should beckon us to give assistance to the peoples of the Old World, that assistance can be given when the time comes as readily and strongly as it has been done in the past, and all the more efficiently and strongly because this Nation has been permitted to grow up and pursue its destiny unhampered by the restrictions of a league which makes its soldiery, its armament, its Navy, and all its other facilities of defense subject to inspection and regulation from abroad.

"In conclusion, as it seems to me, the questions which are raised here and elsewhere as to the desirability of the league present, at least, arguable matter. If we are at all right in the objections expressed to the league of nations, then the most serious crisis which the American people have encountered since they formed their country is now upon them. Upon what possible theory is debate eliminated and discussion made wrong in regard to a matter so interwoven with all our political history and so fraught with possibilities of evil and harm for our future? Without any criticism of the motives of the Chief Executive, and conceding to him no other purpose than to secure ideal conditions for the world, we must not forget that the history of all republics has been the elimination of the bodies representing the people from the councils of the State and the substitution therefor of the act of the executive. The people, without any thought of disloyalty, care nothing for courts or Congress. They only ask an executive who shall carry out their wishes at the time. The executive, in like manner, naturally and sincerely cares only to interpret and carry forward the wishes of the people. The constant tendency always has been to eliminate any traditional or constitutional provisions intended to act as a check upon the actions of the executive department. There can be no more striking instance of that than the proposition that the treaty of peace should receive automatic approval at once and as a matter of course by the Senate, and not only that, but, as a part of it and automatically and without objection, the Senate should approve and enter into the league of nations.

"Whatever may be the right course or the wrong course in regard to the league, whatever may be the call of humanity or the call of wisdom in relation to this country and the other nations of the world, as evidenced by the league, it certainly seems clear that not only is it due the importance of the subject considered, but it is due the preservation and protection of our own institutions in their most vital aspect that there should be a free and full discussion of the proposed league on its own merits, quite separate and apart from the European peace, a peace which should not be delayed against the clamors of all mankind by coupling with it and requiring automatic acceptance of covenants surrendering the sovereignty of our country."

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a summary of the league of nations prepared by Maj. Gen. William Crozier.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[By Maj. Gen. William Crozier.]

"The peace treaty having been finally signed, and being about to be taken up for formal consideration by the Senate as soon as it can be physically gotten before that body, an estimate of the status to which the scattered debate and the discussion in the public press have brought it has a greater interest now than at any previous time, and a correct estimate ought to afford some indication of the chance of the treaty's ratification.

"Significant difference of opinion, of course, centers about the covenant of the league of nations, which the intense opposition of its opponents in the Senate failed to cause the conferees to omit from the treaty, and it is there as Part I. It can fairly be said that no other features of the treaty have given rise to such objection in the Senate as to jeopardize the ratification if the differences in regard to the covenant can be composed. The points in the covenant which have given rise to the most controversy are found in articles 1, 8, 10, and 15.

"The last paragraph of article 1 provides for the withdrawal of a nation from the league upon two years' notice, provided that all of its obligations shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal. Mr. Root, in a letter to Mr. Lodge of June 19, 1919, called attention to the fact that a claim of unfulfilled obligations ought not to operate to keep a nation wishing to withdraw indefinitely in the league, and proposed a reservation in language explaining a corresponding understanding. As it is undoubtedly the intention to permit withdrawal there would probably be no objection to a reservation for making the intention effective.

"Article 8 relates to the limitation of armaments, and provides, among other things, that plans for the limitation having been adopted by the several governments the limits fixed shall not be exceeded without the consent of the council of the league. As the covenant itself contemplates war under certain contingencies this provision can only relate to the peace-time armaments of the nations, since it would be absurd for a nation to go to war under an agreement forbidding it to increase its armed forces. An explanatory reservation to this effect would probably not meet with objection.

"Article 10 is familiar as the one containing the undertaking to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league against external aggression. It has given rise to a great deal of controversy, and Mr. Root in his letter to Senator Lodge advised against its acceptance, pointing out the danger of attempting to commit our people to the forcible preservation in the future of boundaries in which their interest would be small and their sympathies might be on opposite sides. But another objection may be raised against article 10, in that it guarantees the integrity and political independence of countries where, perhaps, these attributes ought not to be guaranteed. For example, we think we waged a righteous war against Spain, and for a good object, namely, the freeing of Cuba from the inefficient sovereignty of the old country; but the process impaired the territorial integrity of Spain, which if the covenant had been in force at the time not only would we have been under engagement to respect but the other member nations would have promised to preserve against our assaults upon it.

"Also, in accomplishing what we have in San Domingo we have undoubtedly impaired, temporarily we hope, the political independence of that country, very much to the advantage of the world, including the Dominicans.

"Other examples might be given in which it would have been unfortunate to respect the political independence of a backward country in which government was not carried on in the interest of the governed and where there was no semblance of the consent of the governed to the exercise of governmental powers, because the governed were too ignorant to give or to withhold any effective consent. There have been and still are such countries, and respect of their political independence is more unfortunate for their own inhabitants than for anybody else.

"Article 10 selects two attributes of the member nations, and undertakes to guarantee them, but article 11 declares any threat of war to be a matter of concern to the whole league, and would seem to cover sufficiently aggression against territorial integrity or political independence without a special article for these latter. It is true, however, that we are setting up a number of new nations, and it would perhaps not be inadvisable to help guarantee their boundaries for a short time, until the important neighboring nations should have time to arrange for their protection. It would certainly seem to be more their task than ours. If, therefore, the Senate should ratify the treaty with the reservation that the United States would not be bound by article 10 beyond a certain date, it would free us from the objectionable indefinite engagement, and ought not to constitute an amendment which would require immediate reconsideration of the treaty by the conferees.

"There remains article 15, which is the most important article in the covenant in that it is the one which prescribes the method for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes which are not submitted to arbitration. It is intended to cover all matters of antagonistic policy, which have been the most fruitful causes of the world's wars. In the article the member nations agree that they will submit to the council of the league or to the

assembly any dispute likely to lead to a rupture which is not submitted to arbitration, and that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the conclusions reached. This is very far-reaching, and it is worth while to examine the procedure and see how it would have worked out in some of the disputes in which we have been engaged and which we thought sufficiently important to be worth fighting about.

"Coming back to the Spanish War, it will be remembered that we went into this war because of the long-continued disorder in Cuba, which ample trial had shown Spain to be unable to cure, and of which the crowning evidence had been the destruction of our war vessel in the harbor of Habana, the Spanish Government being unable to prevent the destruction or to tell who had been guilty of it. After many ineffective warnings, we made up our minds that the only effective remedy lay in the expulsion of the Spanish power from the island. That is, we concluded that Cuba must be withdrawn from the sovereignty of Spain and given her independence. Of course, we would have preferred to secure relief through peaceful means, and if the league of nations had been in existence, under the proposed covenant we should have examined the possibility of relief through the action of a court of arbitration. We could have filed a complaint against Spain, and could probably have counted upon securing from the court an order based upon a finding that the state of affairs in Cuba constituted a nuisance, and to the effect that Spain should abate the nuisance by restoring order. But this is just what we had concluded that Spain, after years of trial, was unable to do; and the order of the court would have left us no further along toward our purpose of relief than we had been before. To try to give effect to such an order would simply have meant more delay and the further endurance of the nuisance. What was considered necessary was, as stated above, the termination of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba, but this a court would not have had the power to grant, since it would have involved a revolutionary change, and courts can not be revolutionary but must be guided by the law and the precedent and the established order.

"We would therefore have had to abandon the idea of relief through a court and must have turned to the council or the assembly under article 15. Spain would undoubtedly have preferred a judicial settlement, since her title to sovereignty was well established in the law of nations, and a court would have had to respect it; but the only chance of a peaceful settlement in our favor would have been with a body which would not have been bound to as close a view of the case as a court would have been and could have sought a solution in a wider field than the law. In such a search it would have been seen that a less radical action than the termination of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba might be taken by a recommendation that autonomous government should be established in the island, and, although such recommendation would have bordered very closely on the interference with internal affairs, which is explained to be beyond the province of the league, we have good reason for believing that Spain would have accepted the recommendation, in face of the alternative of war, and would have promised to set up such a government. But we believed that Spain would not be able to carry out the promise, through lack of power and through lack of qualified agents for the difficult task of establishing self-government in a backward country like Cuba, with a large percentage of illiterate inhabitants. We had already considered the suggestion of such a solution and were convinced that it would only have meant more delay and the longer endurance of a situation which had already been endured too long. How well our belief was justified was shown by our own subsequent experience in Cuba, where, notwithstanding our long practice of popular government, we had to take possession of her governmental machinery a second time and run it for years after we had originally installed the machinery by our well-skilled agents and had watched its operation from our advantageous position of proximity.

"Seeking further a solution we found nothing short of the complete withdrawal of Spain from Cuba, which was the conclusion which we arrived at after long and earnest consideration of the problem, in which we were animated by a most sincere desire to avoid war. But the league would have been absolutely barred from granting this solution by the covenant in article 10; and even without this covenant it is impossible to find anything in the proposed scheme for the league which grants it international legislative power, of which a supreme example would be the power to alienate from a nation's sovereignty a portion of its domain. The possession of such power would constitute the league a veritable supergovernment. Here we would have run against a great difficulty, the inability of the league to grant the only relief which we, after long suffering, believed to be adequate. Yet we would have been under a hard and fast agreement not to apply the remedy of war until after we had endured the

delay of submitting the matter to the league, notwithstanding the evident futility of such a process.

"It may be argued that having endured the situation for so many years, we might very well have supported it for the additional time necessary to submit the matter to the league, when the council or the assembly would have soon seen that they could not reach a recommendation of a peaceful settlement, and we would have been free to go ahead with the war. But it is not certain that this would have been the conclusion. We can well remember that there was a strong aversion on the Continent of Europe to having this war take place. Our motives were distrusted, annexation of Cuba being believed to be one of them. Nobody else was suffering particularly from the disorder in Cuba, and in such cases the pressing necessity for relief is not apt to be appreciated by those not suffering. A strong effort was made to bring the concert of Europe to bear in at least limiting the war to American waters.

"The heads of all the diplomatic missions in Washington went in a body to the White House to discourage the war. We had one friend across the Atlantic which prevented action by the concert of Europe, and under the covenant we might have counted upon this friend, perhaps, to prevent a unanimous recommendation of some other course than the only adequate one of war. But European statesmen are conservative, with a strong tendency to remain within the law and the precedent and to discourage revolutionary proceedings; our position before the council would therefore have been a precarious one, with a distinct possibility of a unanimous recommendation that something like the autonomous government scheme be tried.

"So important a matter would probably have been carried by one of the parties or by the council to the assembly, and in that body we would have met the fact that Latin America has never been easy in its mind over our patronizing attitude and the intentions behind it, and would have had the suspicions of its members, and probably their votes, to prevent our freedom to use force in applying to the situation the only remedy which our mature consideration had led us to admit as adequate. It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the league, under the proposed covenant, could not have met the situation and could not have brought about as good a result as the war did, either for ourselves, for Cuba, or for the rest of the world, including Spain, if what we hear of the effect of her relief from her colonial burden is true.

"Other examples of the inadequacy of the proposed covenant can be found without going outside our own history, if it had been in operation at the time of our various crises and its terms had been lived up to. In our war of 1812 the *casus belli* was the impressment into the British service of seamen who were found on American vessels, upon the visitation and search which the British warships had a right to make. High American authorities have since admitted that this practice was sanctioned by previous usage; and the underlying idea of our contention was the new one of the alienability of allegiance, which at that time, and even for many years after, we did not formally put forth ourselves. As the mistakes of Americans for Englishmen were of a kind which were not likely to be made as between other nationalities, it is probable that a council or an assembly of a league of nations would have retained the well-established practice, and we would have been left without relief. Our Revolutionary War and our Civil War were not international, and therefore would not have come under the covenant, but they both afford very good illustrations of the way in which the principles of article 13 and article 15 would have brought about different results from the better ones of the wars. The cause of our Mexican War, having been a boundary dispute, might have been judicially settled, and we would have had a chance of winning out before a court; but it is the only war in which we would have had a fair chance of winning our case before a league, and it is the one which we have ourselves found the most difficult to defend.

"Article 21 of the covenant reserves the validity of the Monroe doctrine, and it has been proposed to make the reservation more explicit by a declaration, upon ratification, that nothing in the treaty shall be construed to require the submission by the United States of its policy regarding questions which it deems purely American to the decision or recommendation of other powers. The covenant itself, as well as the proposed declaration, undoubtedly indicate an admission that we need greater security than that which article 15 affords in regard to these American questions, by which we set great store. Is it consistent, then, to commit ourselves to article 15 in all unforeseen questions of policy which may not be American, such as questions affecting the Philippine Islands, for example, in some of which our policy may be at variance with established international law, as it was in the War of 1812 and in the case of

the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba? A precedent, constituting the international law, may at any time become outworn and be a misfit in a new situation.

"The reservation in the covenant in regard to the Monroe doctrine, and the proposed reservation in regard to all American questions, deny the jurisdiction of the league over such questions, even for purposes of inquiry. In order to show good will toward the purposes of article 15 a less rigid attitude than this might be assumed, and the right of the league to investigate even American questions of dispute might be admitted, while reserving to ourselves freedom to take such final action as our national conscience would dictate to be necessary. We could thus agree to communicate to the secretary general the statement of our case with all the relevant facts and papers, and could facilitate in every way the most open examination; but should keep in our own hands the final decision as to policy. This is the fundamental reservation which must be made if we intend to preserve for our people a national policy in accordance with our own standards, instead of subjecting the policy to the standards of a body of heterogeneous membership, part of which we know to be less advanced than our own. In the conference which has negotiated the treaty itself we are not without example of the way in which injustice may be admitted in order to facilitate some other ends, and it would be something more than unfortunate if we should find ourselves obliged to endure similar injustice because we had made a general agreement not to resist a conclusion by force.

"The reservation with regard to article 15 is the least which we must insist upon if we are to preserve real national independence; but it does not leave the covenant other than an instrument of tremendous force. Article 11, in declaring any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, a matter of concern to the whole league, takes very advanced ground as compared with anything which the nations have agreed to heretofore. In cases of the outbreak of hostilities in which we ourselves, for example, were not interested directly, we have always made our neutrality our first concern, and have embraced it and cherished it as something which we would not be driven from except in the last extremity. We are now, in accepting article 11, abandoning this position; and we can face squarely about from it by further strengthening the article by resolution, declaring that we will be found in any matter which threatens war, with intention to use our power to coerce an unjustified aggressor, or to state why we do not think, upon inquiry, that such action on our part is called for.

"Still further action in the interest of enforcing peace might be taken in connection with the ratification of the treaty. At various conferences the principal nations of the world have agreed upon certain rules for the government of their relations with one another. These rules have formed the best kind of international law, having been formally accepted by all the parties to whom they applied. But they have never been given any sanction. That is, the nations have not put any backbone in them by agreeing to stand behind their enforcement, or to punish or otherwise take cognizance of their infraction. It would not at any previous time have been possible to do so. Action in resentment of their violation has been left entirely to the injured party. Among the rules which have been flagrantly violated in the great European war are many which are contained in the Convention for the Laws of War on Land, and in the Convention on the Rights and Duties of Neutrals, of the Hague conferences. The unsatisfactory status of these rules would be improved by a resolution declaring it to be the policy of the United States to take cognizance of any violation of them, whether it should itself be directly injured by the violation or not, and to take action for the enforcement of the rules, or to state why it would not consider such action to be appropriate in the particular circumstances.

"If a league with machinery constituted about as provided for in the covenant of the league of nations, notwithstanding the reservations above proposed, had been in existence in the summer of 1914, a sharp reminder would have been sent to the Central Powers, by the United States among others, to the effect that machinery would be set in motion to ascertain the merits of the impending conflict, and that our intervention might be expected if an intention of unwarranted disturbance of the peace should be disclosed. Similar action would have been taken by England, who, as things were, did not feel justified in intervening until the neutrality of Belgium had been actually violated and her own treaty guaranty had been thus challenged. Contrast of our own resulting position with the one which we actually did assume shows enough difference to justify the presumption of a different effect upon the war. We not only made the usual prompt announcement of neutrality

but we stated through the mouths of our public officials that we would not even proceed with prudent defensive armament for fear that such action might be interpreted as preparation for taking part in the war.

"It would be unfortunate if we should enter into a treaty containing an obligation which the people of no great nation would live up to when a question of maximum importance should arise. At a time of tremendous stress it is more than doubtful if such a people would be bound by any paper promises made by an earlier generation, and, once infringed, there would be danger that the whole structure of the covenant would come tumbling down. It would be better that our structure should be solid, if more modest, and that conviction of its serviceability should come with practice in its use. If we pile more promises of performance upon a substructure of supposed mutual understanding throughout the whole world than our knowledge of one another warrants, we may find ourselves at the first storm with nothing left us but a heap of ruins. Our gaze, anxiously fixed upon Europe, has not in the last half year discovered such ease in composing differences of interest, even by nations just ending a struggle side by side against a common enemy, as to justify confidence in committing our own vital interests to the custody of what would be in effect a world legislature, without reservation and with agreement to accept the outcome.

"Let us therefore acknowledge our membership in the family of nations and recognize responsibility for a man's part in the family affairs by strengthening our adherence to the principles of article 11 of the covenant. This article contains the essential and vigorous features of the program of the League to Enforce Peace, as stated by Mr. Taft:

The member nations "jointly to use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number making war against another before submitting the issue to either the court or the council of conciliation, and * * * that the league should determine what action, if any, should be taken in respect to recommendations of the council of conciliation in which the parties concerned did not acquiesce."

"Indeed, the article is more comprehensive than Mr. Taft's statement, in that it embraces in its contemplation others as well as members of the league. Neither binds a nation subjectively to accept a conclusion of the council. A stalwart intention with reference to article 11 and a dignified reservation with reference to the peaceful method of article 15 would redeem the treaty from the charge of containing a 'soft' covenant, which is the kind that would probably be favored by all those who desired a soft peace. The covenant would then embody a new state of mind, as compared with that which has animated the world heretofore, and it would be well to practice with it for a while with a view to its improvement."

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record the article of ex-President Taft in yesterday's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT SAYS IF UNITED STATES BACKS OUT OF ARTICLE 10 THE LEAGUE WILL BE ENDANGERED—DECLARES FRANCE AND SMALLER NATIONS WOULD ASK FURTHER CONFERENCES IF ROOT'S SUGGESTIONS WERE FOLLOWED—CALLS FORMER SENATOR'S REASONING, INVOLVING OBJECTIONS OF OUR FOREIGN-BORN CITIZENS, "CURIOUS."

[By William Howard Taft.]

"Mr. Root's letter to Mr. LODGE raises two questions that will bear discussion. He suggests reservations instead of amendments in the ratification, and says that they need not and will not delay the going into effect of the treaty of peace. He says many precedents justify this view. This statement needs analysis in order to understand it and its weight.

"A treaty is a contract. The minds of the contracting parties must meet before it becomes binding on either. One party can not change the contract after the other has agreed to it, and bind the other party to the change, without the other's acquiescence to it. Strictly speaking, a reservation in the consent of the Senate to a signed treaty, though the reservation be only one of interpretation, must be concurred in by the other party if the reservation is to play any future part in construing the treaty. Otherwise, the reservation is merely an ineffective expression of opinion by the Senate. This was the case in the Spanish treaty, where, after ratification, the Senate passed a resolution as to what it meant by its ratification. The Supreme Court held that it had no effect in construing the treaty.

TREATY-MAKING PROCEDURE.

"The ordinary procedure in treaty-making is first the drafting and signing of the treaty by the plenipotentiaries of the contracting Governments. The signed duplicates of the treaty are referred back to the Governments, to be ratified by them. These ratifications are then exchanged between the contracting

Governments and each Government makes known, in its own way, the treaty thus agreed to. It is in the procedure of exchanging the ratifications that such reservations as Mr. Root speaks of are acquiesced in and become part of the treaty. If the ratification of the United States, for instance, contains a reservation to which the Government receiving it makes no objection it may be held to acquiesce in the reservation contained in the ratification of the United States, and thus to agree to make it part of the treaty.

"There is no real distinction in principle between reservations and amendments, but important amendments are not usually incorporated in treaties in this easy, silent, and summary way. The nation receiving a reservation in a ratification would naturally require further negotiation and the conference, if the reservation changes materially the obligation of the parties to the treaty.

PRECEDENTS NOT IMPORTANT.

"The precedents to which Mr. Root refers, therefore, are not important in deciding the question, which his letter raises as to article 10, because the question in each case always is whether the reservation or amendment is so important that the other nations are not likely to let it go without question. If they do not, then negotiations must be resumed and the delay which Mr. Root seeks to avoid must occur. The issue, therefore, is whether the other nations in receiving a ratification of the United States containing a reservation refusing to consent to article 10 and striking it out of the obligations of the United States under the treaty, would accept the ratification, without demanding, as they would have the right, further negotiations before consenting to this change.

"The anxiety of France to strengthen her defense against Germany, apparent throughout the proceedings of the conference, indicates that she would ask further conference. Her representatives labored to secure a provision in the league covenant under which a permanent international police force will be constantly under arms and under a general staff, to act instantly in defense of league members subject to unprovoked attack.

SECURED PROMISES OF BOTH.

"More than this, she secured the promise of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd-George to present to their respective Governments a special defensive treaty securing the instant action of England and the United States in case of an unprovoked attack by Germany. We can reasonably surmise, therefore, that France would seriously object to eliminating an article furnishing her some defense against such attack, however short it may fall of her earnestly expressed wish.

"Moreover, other and smaller nations would probably object. The importance of the article in the whole plan of the league is manifest. It is the inducement by which the weaker nations are brought into a league. It is the chief protection which the league offers them. The fact that the United States, with its great prestige, its disinterestedness, and its moral influence, as well as its military potentiality, is under the obligation of article 10 constitutes the great cautionary and minatory effect of that article, making it powerful as an agency in restraining wars of conquest. If the United States is to back out of the article, the league will be weakened. The nations, great and small, interested in the league, therefore, will not be likely to pass over such an amendment lightly, but will naturally insist on a reexamination of the whole covenant when its character is thus materially changed.

ARGUMENT A CURIOUS ONE.

"Mr. Root's argument that we should refuse consent to article 10 because some of our foreign-born citizens may object to our helping to discipline their native countries under the article is a curious one in view of the lessons of the war just ended. We probably had more natives from Germany than from any one country in our citizenship when we went to war with Germany. Nothing came under more bitter condemnation than their hyphenated citizenship and their opposition to the war. The question which Mr. Root's objection raises, therefore, is whether, after this experience, we are to allow those who seek refuge in our country and enjoy the boon of our freedom and institutions to restrain us from doing our duty and sharing the burden of the world in maintaining peace.

"Shall we thus officially recognize and acquiesce in the generally condemned hyphenated Americanism? Shall we avowedly allow it to influence our future international relations? One of our great national aims, now insisted on, is a more complete Americanization of our foreign-born citizens. Is no reform to be brought about in this regard? Is anticipation of this continued evil to deter us from a course full of world usefulness?"

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two editorials on the subject of the league of nations and two brief addresses by myself on the same and other current issues.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"PITILESS PUBLICITY" DEMANDED.

WASHINGTON, July —.

"The Republican Publicity Association, through its president, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., to-day gave out the following statement from its Washington headquarters:

"Before the peace treaty with its annexed league of nations covenant is finally disposed of by the Senate the Committee on Foreign Relations owes it to the country to conduct hearings and demonstrate the truth or falsity of the various stories of the peace conference that have come to us from time to time. In spite of the fact that the treaty, and particularly the league covenant contained in it, is fraught with more tremendous consequences to the American people than any document that has come before them since the adoption of the Constitution, practically the only source of information concerning the negotiations has been the partially censored press. The country knows absolutely nothing of the bargains that were made among the delegates to the peace conference in order that the signatures of all the nations might be obtained, and no intimation has been allowed to escape as to the authorship of many of the most important provisions.

"But although they have been denied authoritative information as the conference progressed, the people have drawn their own conclusions on certain phases of the treaty and covenant that should either be substantiated or proved incorrect. That the committee can easily do by calling before it the members of the personnel of the American delegation and taking their testimony under oath. By combining their statements a connected and accurate story of the proceedings can be obtained, and the people will know at last in what manner their liberties have been trafficked and bartered. Among other things it should be demonstrated—

"1. Is Mr. Wilson the principal author of article 10 of the league covenant, by which we would be bound for all time to preserve 'the territorial integrity and existing political independence' of all members of the league? Such an inference is a natural one, inasmuch as the President used those precise phrases in a speech in January, 1916, in which he advocated similar guaranties for the American Republics.

"2. Why does Mr. Wilson insist that the absurd language of article 21 protects the Monroe doctrine, particularly in view of the fact that English authorities positively assert that it does nothing of the kind?

"3. Under what theory was it that the British Empire has six votes in the league while the United States and other nations are allowed but one each?

"4. Why was the British Empire given control, in the form of mandates, of about four-fifths of the captured German colonial territory; this in spite of the fact that the British Empire already controlled one-quarter of the total land area of the whole world?

"5. What was the so-called American scheme for a league of nations; in what respect did it differ from and why was it discarded in favor of the British plan?

"6. Just what were the considerations that induced Mr. Wilson to agree to urge upon the Senate an alliance guaranteeing protection to France in the event of another war with Germany?

"7. Is it not a fact that upon the rejection of the league of nations by the United States Senate it will be promptly discarded by the other signatory nations and a separate peace with Germany proceeded with immediately?

"8. Was there an accurate report, stenographic or otherwise, kept of the proceedings of the various commissions which transacted the real work of the peace conference? If so, is there any reason why the Senate should not be put in possession of a copy of every such record?

"9. What is the true and unabridged story of the China-Japan-Shantung controversy?

"10. Where did Mr. Wilson derive his authority, either as President of the United States or as its peace commissioner, to issue what amounted to an appeal to the Italian people to overthrow their government?

"11. Why should a portion of the Turkish Empire be selected for administration by the United States as mandatory? If this country must be a mandatory for any captured territory, why not select that which formerly belonged to the country

with which we were at war—Germany—and which is certainly far more desirable than a province peopled by the unspeakable Turk?

"These are but a few of the mysteries that confront the American people, which it is their right to have cleared up before they bind themselves under terms that involve those questions. The power that vitalizes a treaty originates in the people. The individuals who represent them in the conference have behind them no possessions of their own with which to negotiate. They merely draw up a tentative arrangement that must be submitted for approval or rejection to the people through their representatives in the Senate. In order that that action may be intelligent the Senate and the public should have in their possession all the data that was available to the negotiators themselves. It is within the power of the Foreign Relations Committee to get it.

"Not only should these questions receive pitiless publicity in order to insure proper action on the treaty, but it must not be forgotten that the Democratic Party will have as its candidate for the Presidency next year the individual who headed our peace delegation or a man who entertains the same views. It is essential that all the facts surrounding the activities of Mr. Wilson in Paris should be brought to light that the people may know what sort of Americanism has actuated him. If he has proven faithless to his trust to 'preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States,' the voters should know it in order that he or the candidate who embodies his views may be properly rebuked at the polls. It may even transpire that the evidence is of such a character as to warrant laying it before the House for appropriate action under the impeachment clause of the Constitution. In any event we should have it before us as a basis for future action."

AMERICANISM WITH PEACE OR INTERNATIONALISM WITH WAR?

[Persistent efforts are being made to cajole the public into the belief that the league of nations is a "league for peace." To prove the utter falsity of that assertion the Republican Publicity Association, through its president, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., herewith presents an analysis of the covenant by articles, clearly demonstrating that the adoption by the United States of the proposed league of nations means war, not peace.]

"The stock argument of the proponents of the covenant for a league of nations has been that the undertaking will prove an instrument for world peace. They have even gone so far as to characterize it as a 'league of peace,' and its opponents have been denounced as preferring war, as trying to make political capital at the expense of the peace of the world, and as putting obstacles in the way of the future happiness of mankind. Going before the people with their pleas to support the league if they wanted peace, the league advocates have won many individuals to their cause who have accepted the statements of the agitators at their face value without troubling themselves to see if they were borne out by facts. But take the peace cry away from the league advocates and there is nothing left on which to base their claims for support of the covenant.

"The whole structure of the league is centered about the idea of compulsion. Starting with a council of the representatives of nine States, really dominated by three nations, or two, if the United States stays out, it is proposed to subjugate all the rest of the world to its will. The very essence of the covenant is force, to be exerted on any nation which, in the opinion of the council, is not comporting itself according to the rules laid down in the covenant and interpreted by the council.

"The covenant bristles with limitations and restrictions on independent nationalism that will prove a constant irritation to countries accustomed to determine their own affairs free from foreign interference. Almost every article in the covenant, save those that deal purely with administrative routine, has in it the essentials for the creation of friction likely to lead to war between nations; in fact, some of them not only tend to war but make war automatic and compulsory.

"Article 1, in defining the method of withdrawal of a nation from the league, says that two years' notice must be given of the intention to withdraw, and even then permission will not be granted unless the council by unanimous vote decides that that nation's league obligations have been fulfilled. Under those conditions the United States once in would be compelled to remain a member, by international force of arms if necessary, if Japan or Greece or Spain chose to make us do so. The resentment of red-blooded Americans to coercion from such sources would inevitably lead to war.

"Articles 2 and 3 are purely administrative.

"Article 4 states that each member of the league shall have one vote in the assembly. Here, again, is a fruitful source of irritation. Liberia, Cuba, and Panama owe their very existence to the United States, which set them up as independent nations

and has acted as a potential guarantor of their integrity ever since. Here the creator is controlled by its creations, which are given three times the voting strength of the power that made them. Other nations that depend for the maintenance of their independent sovereignty on the American Monroe doctrine are given equal voting power in the league assembly with the great people who protect them. Haiti, Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras are cases in point. Is the United States likely to submit tamely when, perchance, those little Central American Republics raise a question inimical to the welfare of our country and proceed to outvote us 5 to 1?

"Article 5 stipulates that 'decisions at any meeting of the assembly or of the council shall require the agreement of all the members of the league represented at the meeting.' Certain exceptions of minor importance are made to that rule, but it holds good in the settlement of all questions of great moment. The complications that are sure to arise from the application of this regulation are endless, each of them certain to produce international tension that will lead to war if its strict enforcement is insisted upon by the league members. Germany is soon to be a member, and as such could effectually veto any policy that we might formulate toward Mexico. Inasmuch as the Germans were active in fomenting an anti-American attitude in Mexico during the war, it is not difficult to foresee her policy when she is in the league. Our interference in Cuba to save that country from Spanish oppression could and would have been prevented had the league been in operation in 1898. One nation registering its objection to our Cuban policy would have necessitated its cancellation, and the horrors of Spanish rule in the island would have continued. In short every State in the league, big or little, has the power within itself to invalidate the actions of all the others combined. The moment that arrogant authority, granted by the league covenant itself, is sought to be exercised war will follow unless this great Republic of the United States and the peoples of the world are to be directed by a lot of unstable nations, large or small, in problems which they do not understand and are not capable of solving.

"Article 6 provides for the appointment of the first secretary general of the league and authorizes him to appoint the secretaries and all other members of the league staff. That official has already been named. He is an Englishman of note, and doubtless a very worthy and able gentleman—but an Englishman, with all that the word implies. If there is one trait that distinguishes a British citizen above all others it is loyalty to king and country. Everything is subordinated to service of the Empire. Every incident in English history is a separate incentive to the Britisher to think of his country first, last, and all the time. The secretary of the league, with his absolute power to appoint subordinates, will see to it that the personnel, if not composed entirely of Englishmen like himself, are completely amenable to his dictation. How will Americans like that situation, and are they likely to accept it with submissive acquiescence? Would we not feel a little resentful if every official in our own Senate and House of Representatives was an Englishman? Yet in this supergovernment, clothed with power to override almost anything our own Congress may do, the entire secretarial work, including the care of the archives, is under the complete jurisdiction of England. Is that a tendency toward peace or war?

"Article 7 establishes the seat of the league at Geneva. That means that our destinies are to be determined by a court sitting 3,000 miles distant from our own shores, only a cable connecting us with the proceedings, and even that means of communication subject to such censorship restrictions as may be prescribed at the time. Our experiences during the war have shown how easy it is for all news from across the water to be denied us when the officials so decree. The location of the headquarters of the league at Geneva simply means that the question of our participation in world wars, of tremendous taxation on our people, of life or death to our soldiers, and of our commercial relations with other nations of the world, are to be considered and determined behind closed doors, so far as our keeping in touch with them is concerned. Is that state of affairs likely to promote peace and contentment, or will it probably engender irritation likely to find expression in armed resentment?

"Article 8 relates to disarmament. It provides that the council, 'taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State,' shall plan the reductions in the armies and navies of the several nations. After those plans have been accepted they shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the council. Here is the situation proposed: Each nation submits a report of its military and naval strength to the council of nine, and those gentlemen, putting their wisdom of the

affairs of all nations ahead of the knowledge possessed by the representatives of those nations themselves, proceed to cut down and pare away armies and navies according to their own conception of national needs. England, seeing at once the danger of such an arrangement, has made a reservation that, no matter what is done, the supremacy of her fleet shall not be endangered. The United States, on the other hand, would be completely at the mercy of the council, dominated as it will be by eight foreign votes to our one. Is that a situation into which you want to project your country, and are we going to accept with equanimity the judgment of that council when it orders us to dismantle our modern battleships, remove fortifications from our coasts and the Panama Canal, and destroy our Army organization that has been built up at such fearful cost? Do you believe in putting in the hands of foreigners the power to run riot and ad libitum with our national defenses?

"The last paragraph of article 8 obligates the members of league to 'interchange full and frank information' of the 'condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.' Which of our industries is not 'adaptable to warlike purposes?' In the last two years practically every industry in this country has been working for the success of our armies, with more or less direct application of its product to the actual fighting. This provision of the covenant means nothing more or less than the publication of every trade secret that enters into the success of American industry. Even patents may be construed to come within the definition of 'full and frank information.' Industrially, this paragraph puts our manufacturers completely at the mercy of foreign competitors who care to take advantage of the opportunity it affords. Again, do you think such a course is wise, either from your standpoint as an American citizen or as a member of humanity in general? Article 8, purporting to turn swords into ploughshares, carries almost in its every word the germs of future wars, and is nicely calculated to excite deep-seated animosities sure to lead to international bloodshed if the irritating cause is continued.

"Article 9 provides for the creation of a permanent commission to advise the council on the execution of the military and naval questions involved in articles 1 and 8. It is not stated what authority shall appoint the members of the commission, but probably the council will make the appointments and the national complexion of the commission will be akin to that of the council. The activities of such a body of experts will merely add a touch of refinement to the decisions of the council and accentuate the world-wide resentment by which its decisions will be received.

"Article 10 breathes war from its first word to the last. This is the provision that pledges member nations to preserve the 'territorial integrity and existing political independence' of every member of the league. Its acceptance by the United States is certain to involve this country in foreign wars with States with which we have no quarrel and perhaps are on the most friendly terms. The sentiment of the article is the direct antithesis of peace. It proposes to extend to all the world every local disturbance, precisely as the dispute between Serbia and Austria involved the nations of both hemispheres. It is preposterous to call the covenant a 'league for peace' when it contains such a mandatory summons to war. Article 10 alone is sufficient to damn the league covenant forever in the eyes of everyone who really wishes to see a step taken in the direction of future peace.

"Article 11 is nothing more or less than an automatic declaration of war for every member of the league. Its opening sentence reads as follows:

"Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league.

"Under this provision the United States, if a member, immediately becomes involved in every war of the future, no matter how remote from our own shores, regardless of our relations with the parties to the dispute, or our desire to remain at peace. Our soldiers and sailors, to all intents and purposes, automatically become hirelings of the league, subject to orders to proceed to the scene of bloodshed and fight against the country that the council may deem to be in the wrong. Do you want to send your boys off on such a mission? What becomes of the 'league-for-peace' cry in the light of this article?

"Article 12 includes an agreement by member nations to submit to arbitration or to the council any dispute in which they may be involved, and not to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report of the council. It is provided that in such cases the arbitrators shall submit their award 'within a reasonable time' and the council 'within six months.' Suppose the dispute had been submitted to the

council, then a period of nine months may elapse before a nation is permitted to vindicate its right by force of arms. Meanwhile it must stand idly by and witness perhaps the destruction of its civilization, the murder of its nationals, and the overthrow of its government. This provision is really a prohibition against the establishment of peace. If you find your family menaced by a gang of thugs, you are prevented from raising a finger in protest until the matter has been thoroughly thrashed out by a regularly constituted board of umpires. Is that a theory you wish to see applied to the United States in its dealings with Mexico, for instance? Article 12 is an insurance of war rather than a step toward peace.

"Article 13, like the provisions that precede it, contemplates war, but under different circumstances. After providing for the reference of disputes to arbitration and the award of the arbitrators, the article reads, 'In the event of any failure to carry out such an award, the council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.' The ominous meaning of that declaration is apparent. The nation that declines to abide by the decision of a council, stacked 8 to 1 against it, is to feel the full force of such 'steps' as the council may prescribe. In other words, war will be waged against the disobedient nation until it is willing to subjugate itself to the will of the league. Here, again, we have war, not peace, with the United States inevitably involved if it shall be a member of the league.

"Article 14 stipulates that the council shall formulate 'plans for the establishment of a permanent court of international justice.' Inasmuch as the council, the secretariat, and the assembly are dominated by England, it is not difficult to forecast the complexion of the court. While it is not mandatory for a nation to submit its disputes to that particular court, the inference is plain that such a reference is expected. Article 14 does not have the elements of friction in it possessed by most of the other sections of the covenant, but it is easy to see that disagreements and misunderstandings, liable to lead to open rupture, may arise from the judgments of such a court.

"Article 15 is the section that pretends to reserve so-called domestic questions for determination by the nation concerned, free from interference by the league. This is the article under which England will reserve to herself the determination of the Irish problem. Insurrection and bloodshed may run rampant in Ireland for all that the league of nations will do to prevent it. Likewise, revolution may disrupt every country on the face of the globe before the league will step in with its courts of arbitration, council, assembly, and other machinery for 'peace' to bring about a cessation of the carnage. The inconsistency of the league as an agent for peace is conclusively demonstrated by this article. Members of the same national family may murder each other with impunity, but let one of them shoot somebody on the other side of the border, and the league awakes to the fact that there is trouble brewing for humanity and fusses about to find a remedy.

"Article 16 prescribes in considerable detail the methods that will be followed by the league in enforcing its decrees. The moment a nation resorts to war to preserve its national honor in disregard of the obstacles to prompt action put in its path by the covenant it is to feel the might of the league. A world boycott is to be instituted against the offending State at once. All 'financial, commercial, or personal intercourse' with the rest of the world is to be severed, and an international army and navy, recruited from the military strength of the other member nations, are to proceed against the offender. Article 16 is war from start to finish. Force without stint is the prescription set forth in its language.

"Article 17 offers membership in the league to a nation party to a dispute likely to lead to war. If such nation declines to enter the league and assume its obligations, and undertakes to settle its own affairs in its own way, then the drastic punishment prescribed in article 16 will descend upon it. War again! This time it is to come as a measure of coercion to compel a nation to enter the league and yield up its sovereignty to the dictation of foreigners. Let a country assert its independence and evince a determination to mind its own business and compel its neighbors to mind theirs, and its lands are to be laid waste by this 'league for peace,' its nationals slaughtered in the defense of their homes, and the country as a national entity destroyed.

"Article 18 prevents any future treaty from taking effect until it shall have first been registered with the secretary general of the league. This transcends completely the treaty-making power of the Senate, and prevents the consummation of treaties designed to promote amity between nations unless they shall have taken the course prescribed by the meddling league.

Let a country undertake to enter into a separate agreement with its neighbor, as every nation has a perfect right to do, and it is immediately liable to all the rigors of military and economic pressure that the league can bring to bear. Situations have often arisen in the past when the interference of a third party in the treaty agreements between two nations have led to war, and it is easily conceivable that they may be repeated in the future.

"Article 19 empowers the assembly to advise member nations to reconsider treaties that the assembly thinks have become inapplicable. No compulsion to change such treaties is contained in the article, but the inference is plain or the provision would never have been included in the covenant. England, it is understood, intends to reserve the treaty of alliance she has with Japan, but what will happen to other nations that persist in keeping their international obligations is a matter of conjecture.

"Article 20 goes a step further than 19 and binds members of the league to abrogate all obligations or understandings inconsistent with the terms of the covenant. That means that a member nation, having a treaty with a nonmember nation, shall immediately repudiate its written word. Such a state of affairs has been productive of wars from time immemorial. Germany started hostilities by repudiating her treaty with Belgium and invading that unhappy country. But the league actually proposes to make such repudiations mandatory. Any self-respecting nation that is thus flouted by another with which it has a solemn undertaking is justified in resorting to arms, and such will be the result of a general application of the principle enunciated in article 20.

"Article 21 is declared by President Wilson to preserve the Monroe doctrine. English authorities say it does nothing of the sort. Here is a clash even before the league becomes an actuality. Suppose we proceed on the theory that our Monroe doctrine is not invaded by the league and undertake to enforce its restrictions against foreign States. Immediately there is conflict with the league, and it becomes incumbent upon us to retreat from our position or fight. We are at once confronted with the alternative of abject surrender or war.

"Article 22 is the one under which mandatories are to be provided for weak States. It is suggested that Armenia and possibly Constantinople are to be allotted to the United States. Think of the millions of dollars and scores of precious American lives that will be sacrificed if we undertake the policing of that portion of the Turkish Empire. However great our compassion for the sufferings of the Armenians, are we ready to send armies for their protection against the cruel Turk? Actual war may not result from article 22, but unnecessary shedding of good American blood is inevitable if we assume the obligations that it contemplates.

"Article 23, among other things, declares that members 'will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communication and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league.' This is a vague and dangerous obligation for any nation to assume, full of pitfalls if it is to be literally enforced. This is another world guarantee, this time of a commercial nature, to which every nation becomes a party. Is the United States to insure the inviolability of the commerce of Hedjaz, for instance, or Czechoslovakia or Serbia or Siam? Contemplate, if you can, the manifold complications in which we would become involved were we to adopt such obligations, any one of which might easily plunge us into war if our duty was conscientiously performed.

"Article 24 places all international bureaus under the direction of the league. That means that the Pan-American Union, designed to foster more amicable relations between the American republics, shall move its headquarters from Washington and become a part of the organization of the league at Geneva. The Union heretofore has been a power for peace, enabling the United States to keep in close touch with affairs to the south of us. With its relegation to far-away Switzerland, much of its potency in that direction will be lost.

"Article 25 contains an agreement to encourage national Red Cross organizations, having as purposes 'the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.' Probably a belated realization of the world trouble that will be hatched the moment the league becomes a reality prompted its authors to insert this encouragement to the Red Cross, so that it will be prepared for what is to come.

"Article 26 prescribes the method of amendment of the covenant. Before taking effect an amendment must receive the unanimous vote of the council, and also a majority of the assembly. Such restrictions make it practically impossible for an individual State to succeed in getting amendments that it de-

sires, and a failure to do so is bound to lead to strained relations and possibly open rupture. Compulsion is the keynote of this article, as it is of the whole covenant.

"During our life as a Nation we have not enjoyed uninterrupted peace. But the wars in which we have been engaged concerned issues directly affecting our national life and welfare. Any man who would have suggested that we rush into Asia to settle a controversy between China and Japan would have been branded as insane. It never entered anybody's head in 1904 that we should interfere by force in the Russian-Japanese War. Yet each and every one of the Old World conflicts that take place in the future is to be made 'a matter of concern' to the United States, and we are to become embroiled in it if we subscribe to the obligations of the league covenant.

"A policy of Americanism means that we go to war only to protect our country from foreign aggression. The policy of internationalism embodied in the league means that we go to war to protect every other country on the face of the globe from foreign aggression. Which do you prefer? Is it to be 'Americanism with peace, or internationalism with war?'"

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

[Speech of Senator POINDEXTER at Rochester, N. Y., July 4, 1919.]

"It is of deep significance that as Americans gather to-day to celebrate the severance of their union with a European power it is proposed by the highest authorities in the land that we should form again a union with European powers. The establishment of American independence has had a more profound effect upon civilization and the destinies of man than any other event in history. Sir Edward Creasy in his *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World* says:

"The war which rent away the North American Colonies from England is, of all subjects in history, the most painful for an Englishman to dwell on. It was commenced and carried on by the British ministry in iniquity and folly, and it was concluded in disaster and shame. But the contemplation of it can not be evaded by the historian, however much it may be abhorred. Nor can any military event be said to have exercised more important influence on the future fortunes of mankind than the complete defeat of Burgoyne's expedition in 1777; a defeat which rescued the revolted colonists from certain subjections, and which, by inducing the courts of France and Spain to attack England in their behalf, insured the independence of the United States and the formation of that trans-Atlantic power which not only America but both Europe and Asia now see and feel.

"When Miltiades, with a small force, pierced the center of the Persian hosts on the Plain of Marathon and drove them into the sea the question of whether the ideals of Greece or those of Asia should govern the western world was decided forever.

"When Charles Martel, 'The Hammer,' broke the power of the all-conquering Saracens at Tours, Europe and its colonies of the west were saved for Christianity from the doctrines of the Moslem faith.

"When Cornwallis laid down his sword at Yorktown, the doctrines of the natural rights of man and of government by the people were planted upon the earth, never to perish.

"By the extraordinary blessings of Providence a race of statesmen and soldiers, without equal in all the annals of men in their combination of talent and virtue, was raised up in America to take advantage of the great opportunity. Without the divine inspiration of Henry, which enabled him to look beyond the forms and precedents of government, and the flaming genius of his eloquence, which aroused the people, independence could not have been achieved. It needed also the patience, the infallible judgment, the military genius, the self-devotion of Washington; and to fix in the stable forms of government the liberty which they had won required also the practical statesmanship and wise business sagacity of Jefferson, Hamilton, Franklin, and their great associates.

"Through the influence of this example France was led and strengthened to make her fight for liberty and to plant the banners of republican government in the midst of the imperial standards of Europe. By this great example also the subject peoples of Latin America raised the standard of freedom, and the movement of liberty thus begun was placed upon a permanent foundation by the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, which placed the aegis of the great Republic between the weak peoples of the New World and the ambitions of European kings.

"For a hundred and forty-three years we have celebrated on each anniversary the declaration of our independence from a European power. For a hundred and forty-three years, under a Government that emphasizes the liberty of the individual and minimizes the interference of the State on the great field of the North American Continent our race has expanded in the mighty drama of the West. Under the conditions established by the inspired fathers and leaders of the Republic, our people as a Nation have risen to the highest state of man. We have set up as the supreme object of society the happiness of the citizen rather than the grandeur of the Government; and yet

we have proved the paradox that the government which is the servant of its people is the most powerful among the nations. For a century and a half the spirit of liberty and self-reliance was developed in the necessities and adventures of colonial life. It was planted, as their very essence, in the bills of rights, the charters of liberty, the constitutions and laws of the States and of the Union, and for a century and a half it has shaped the issues of our national life. It found preeminent expression in the Declaration of Independence, and its temple of safety in the Constitution of the United States. It is to that spirit of liberty we pay tribute to-day. We gather to worship at its shrine for our own spiritual exaltation and that the fires on the holy altar of freedom may never grow dim. American liberty is the genuine liberty and not the fatal and spurious liberty of Bolshevism, which means the death of freedom, and which, while parading as liberty, is in truth the most pitiless despotism ever practiced, either among savage tribes or civilized nations. American liberty is the liberty of law. It is voluntary subjection of a self-governing people to laws made by themselves, in which no class is recognized, and the rights of person and property are regarded as sacred, as the very foundations of liberty.

"Now for 300 years, at first loosely associated as neighboring Colonies, with the same body of laws, the same traditions of liberty and security, similar conditions and ambitions, and then as one Nation, our people have been the most fortunate of all the world. Possessed of a common language, unequalled even by the Greek, and understood in all parts of the earth, our thoughts have been quickened by apt words of expression. Protected by our laws, we have had the incentive of effort, knowing that we and our children would enjoy the wages of our labor. Freed of governmental paternalism, we developed initiative and have acquired both individual and national prosperity. With our laws we inherited a great religion, and humble ourselves not before men or idols but before the true and living God. We have led mankind in the inventions of genius and have greatly increased the comfort and the productive capacity of the world. We have verified the vision of Milton of 'a mighty and puissant people,' rousing itself, as a strong man after sleep, as a young eagle mewing his immortal wing and lighting his undazzled eye in the full noonday sun.

"Certain cardinal principles of government have characterized our growth as a Nation. One of these, which distinguishes us from all other people, is the abolishment of privilege. Our law recognizes no class, and our Constitution guarantees to every citizen the 'equal protection of the law.' And we have enthroned in the center of the temple of our State and have guarded it as more precious than life itself that principle which we celebrate to-day—the sovereignty and complete independence of the United States. And yet this Fourth of July, as we are gathered here to celebrate the declaration of our independence from Europe, is the first in 143 years when, instead of giving ourselves over wholly to gratitude for our liberties, we actually find our people engaged in a discussion whether we will unite again our fortunes with Europe, from which we were freed in blood and tears. True it is, as the President said at Suresnes on Memorial Day, that our people 'do not realize what has happened.' For the first time, as we meet to celebrate our independence, we find ourselves confronted by the demand that we must make the supreme sacrifice of joining our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere. Glorifying to-day in that advantage which has been earned by the toil and heroism of our people and preserved by the wisdom of our statesmen, we are told on high authority that the day of national advantage has come to an end. The independence of America and the greatness it has achieved has been the greatest blessing that has ever come to the world; and yet we are told that in the interest of humanity we must sacrifice this fortress of freedom. The most potent factor in preserving the peace of the world has been the power and independence of the United States, and yet we are told in the name of peace we must submerge our independence into a greater United States of the World. The immemorial policy of our statesmen, from Washington to Roosevelt, has been 'peace and honest friendship with all nations'; and yet we are told that 'we are ashamed of our past and ready to forget it.'

"I see before me the returned heroes of this war. I am not ashamed of the record they have made. It is a record of imperishable glory. I have seen a people, lulled into a false security, in a state of unpreparedness, for two years after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, finally led into war, to give belated redress to the wrongs which had been done them, astonish the world by the unity of their patriotism. I am not ashamed of their sacrifices and devotion. They avenged the wrongs of our citizens and restored the essential rights of the Nation on land

and sea. Their devotion is not to be forgotten, but preserved in holy memory forever. Nor are we ashamed of our fathers nor of the 'old order.'

"We are told that to secure the cooperation of nations to preserve peace we must establish a league of nations and put under its control the 'major forces of mankind.' On the contrary, we have on all occasions cooperated with other nations to preserve peace, without surrendering our independence to a league of nations. The most recent instance of this was our cooperation with other nations to enforce peace against Germany. We did this effectively, without a league of nations. In fact, should the power to enforce peace be surrendered to a league of nations, with its own distinct government, there could be no such thing as the free cooperation of nations to enforce peace, since the nations would have divested themselves of this power and conferred it upon the league of nations, which alone would have the power to act.

"The Monroe doctrine, the unwritten law of our foreign policy, was the declaration of the determination of the United States to cooperate with all the nations of the Western Hemisphere to preserve them in peace against the assaults of Europe. This essential principle has done more to preserve peace for a hundred years than all the leagues of nations ever formed. It is proposed now to abandon it in the name of the very peace which it has preserved, and to give to a league of nations, dominated by Europe, complete jurisdiction over every international dispute in which America may be involved.

"It is said Germany would not have commenced the war if she had known the United States would join the forces against her. All that was necessary to make this known to her was for the United States to have announced it. Rev. Henry Van Dyke brought to this Government an appeal from France and England to join them in curbing Germany. The appeal was rejected. It could have been accepted without a league of nations. We finally did join the Allies against Germany without a league of nations.

"It is said that a league is necessary to enforce peace. Peace was enforced against Germany without the league, and such a military power as Germany possessed will not menace the world again in 50 years.

"It is said the league will bring peace to the world. The nations are now cooperating together in Paris. They have not brought peace to the world. War is going on in 20 places in the world—in Russia, in Siberia, in Jugo-Slavia, in Hungary, in Poland, in Turkey, in Mexico, in Haiti, in Germany. What will the league of nations do to enforce peace in these countries that the military powers now sitting in a peace congress can not do, or refuse to do? If we desire to enforce peace, can not we enforce peace in Costa Rica, or Haiti, or Mexico, without the assistance of a league of nations?

"It is said all future wars can be prevented by a league of nations. If that is so, why did not the great league of nations of 1839 for the neutrality of Belgium prevent the invasion of Belgium by one of the members of the league? Will the new league be any less a 'scrap of paper' than the old one?

"It is said a league of nations is necessary for a limitation of armaments. If this is so, how was disarmament effected on the Canadian border without a league of nations? If disarmament could be effected on the Canadian border without a league, why can not it be done elsewhere? The truth is disarmament can not be ordered by a league of nations but can only be brought about, if at all, by conference and free action and agreement among the nations.

"The league to enforce peace provides neither for peace nor for disarmament.

"It is said that as litigants submit to the decree of a court, nations ought to submit to the decrees of a league of nations. This is an admission that the independence and sovereignty of the Nation is to be surrendered. The court represents the sovereign power of government and disposes of the lives, liberties, and property of parties, and force is back of its decrees; otherwise they would be worthless. We submit to it because it is our own Government, under our control. If a league dominated by foreign powers is to have such control over the United States, then the liberty we are celebrating to-day will be at an end.

"But it is said that other nations surrender as much as we do. This is not true; but, even if it were true, it would be but poor consolation for the loss of our independence to know that other nations had lost theirs. The Kaiser and his socialist followers undertook to set up a power that would have internationalized the world, just as is proposed by the Bolsheviks and the Industrial Workers of the World, who propose to set up an international government to enforce peace under the 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' If they succeed, all nations will have given up the same liberties, and, as all would be on the same

footing, according to the league argument, none should object. But such an equality of dishonor would be but a poor compensation for the loss of freedom.

"Peace has been earned by victory and will be preserved by the continued cooperation of the free nations of the world and not by the surrender of their independence to a league.

"There is another menace to our liberties in the propaganda of Bolshevism. Bolshevism is the doctrine of communism to be brought about by force. It is a revolutionary movement, with the object of the forcible seizure and confiscation of all property and its distribution among the revolutionists. This movement is based upon the doctrine of class rule. It would put the Government in the hands of one class and proscribe and exterminate by fire, blood, and starvation all other classes. Its rule would be based on despotism, denying liberty of speech and of the press, and basing its power solely on the doctrine of force. It is put forward in the name of labor, but in fact would be utterly destructive of labor. The only protection of the laboring man is the law. Bolshevism would destroy the law. The only incentive to labor is the vested right of the laborer in his wages. Bolshevism denies the principle of property, without which the fruits of industry would be impossible. Bolshevism would destroy industry and there would be no labor. The end would be the destruction of civilization and a reversion to barbarism, if not the extermination of the race.

"Printing presses are being operated and tons of literature are being distributed advocating this anarchy. Most of its advocates are foreigners. Every alien Bolshevik should be deported at once.

"Both the league of nations and the revolutionary movement of Bolshevism are being supported by vast sums of money and have the encouragement of persons in official position. International big business is backing the league of nations and the international pacifists are supporting both the league of nations and Bolshevism.

"Prussianism, with its socialist backing, league of nationsism, and Bolshevism have this in common. Each proposes to secure peace throughout the world by a central force to enforce peace. Each proposes a central world government. Each is based on internationalism as opposed to the doctrine of nationality. Each alike would mean perpetual war or the sinking of civilization into a despotism that would be worse than death.

"As an illustration of the disappointments and the cruel despotism of the league of nations, it is said the Koreans believed President Wilson would appear in an aeroplane and set them free from Japan. Hopeless insurrection and many deaths resulted, while in the meantime the league of nations was busily engaged in making a compact with Japan whereby instead of freeing the Koreans 30,000,000 Chinese were transferred to her control.

"The land is full of Tories, as in 1776, and it is time for every patriot to be on guard."

[In an address before the Fifteenth District Republican Club, New York, June 24, 1919, on the future of the Republican Party, Senator POINDEXTER said, in part:]

"The mission of the Republican Party in the immediate future is to save the Republic from the process of national disintegration in progress during the present administration. The administration has abandoned our citizens in Mexico to murder and robbery. The Republican Party should elect a President who will fulfill the responsibilities we have assumed in Mexico and reassert American honor and self-respect, so that our citizens, lawfully in that country, will not be forced to ransom their lives with money. After six years of Democratic vacillation and weakness in dealing with Mexico, the suggestion now made in some quarters that Great Britain should be invited to restore order in Mexico should be denounced as false to our fundamental policies, and a Republican Congress should restore order in Mexico and adjust on correct principles its international obligations.

"The act of the Democratic Congress and President internationalizing the Panama Canal should be repealed and that waterway restored again as the property of the people of the United States, to be used in such a way as will be of greatest possible benefit to them, with foreign nations on the same footing among themselves, as provided by treaty.

"The promise of the Democratic administration to haul down the American flag in the Philippine Islands should be repudiated, and a Republican President and Congress should make it clear that the blessings of liberty, which the people of those islands have enjoyed under American rule, will be preserved and the mutual advantage of trade and industrial development under the protection of American law retained for our people. The proposal, while abandoning our responsibilities in the Philippines

to assume the government of Constantinople and Armenia, should be repudiated.

"The extraordinary powers vested in the Executive during the emergency of the war should be repealed at once and Government should be restored to a normal basis."

"The direct and oppressive extraordinary taxes, retarding business and increasing the high cost of living, should be reduced and repealed as rapidly as possible. In order to do this the expenditures of the Government should be restored to a normal basis, waste and inefficiency eliminated, war bureaus abolished, and a tariff bill, so framed as to obtain a larger share of revenue from import duties to protect industry, maintain wages, and especially to protect and encourage the new industries established during the war, should be enacted without delay."

"It should be the first care of a Republican administration to stamp out of the country the propaganda of anarchy and revolution. The alien advocates of enforced communism and confiscation should be returned at once and without exception to the country whence they came, and their aiders and abettors in this country, the so-called 'parlor Bolsheviks,' who contribute money to the revolutionary cause, and the officials of the Government, of high and low degree, who have encouraged Bolshevik activities should be exposed and punished."

"The new doctrine of internationalism, advocated alike by the Kaiser and his socialist followers, and by the anarchists and Bolsheviks of Russia and America, should be combated as fatal to our institutions. The effort of the internationalists to 'join our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere,' and to form a United States of the World, should be opposed as wholly inconsistent with American independence and a menace to liberty."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I can not vote for the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany in its present form, and it is because, after as careful and candid a consideration as I have been able to give to the subject, I am inevitably led to this conclusion that I am to-day asking the attention of the Senate while I point out, as briefly as I can, some of the reasons why it seems to me the treaty should be amended. I shall to-day confine my remarks almost entirely to one of its provisions. I do not want to be understood by this that there are not other amendments that in my judgment should be made, but the one provision that I shall confine my remarks to is so indefensible, so unjust, and so wicked that it alone would in my judgment be sufficient to reject the treaty even though every other word contained in it were entirely satisfactory.

Before I take up this particular article, I desire to say that during all my public life I have been a firm believer in some kind of an international agreement between the leading civilized nations of the world that would make war between civilized nations as nearly impossible as human ingenuity could devise. Every drop of my blood cries out aloud in sympathy with what I believe to be the human heartbeats all over the civilized world, that out of this terrible strife, turmoil, blood, and suffering should come some such an agreement. It is a sad commentary upon the civilization of the present age that the great nations of the world, while compelling their citizens to submit their quarrels and disputes to courts and tribunals, organized under general laws for that purpose, should themselves violate the principle of the very law which they enforce upon their subjects. The same principle of law and equity that settles an ordinary lawsuit before a justice of the peace will, if properly applied, without any change or addition, settle every dispute that can possibly arise between nations. War is a relic of barbarism, and can be defended upon no principle that holds sway and controls in any civilized Government. A torn, suffering, bleeding world is heartsick of the barbarous thing that civilization calls war. In the establishment of machinery for the settlement of international disputes in courts of reason rather than upon the battle field no new principle is involved. It only requires the application of those well-understood principles of justice that now apply in all civilized communities. The present treaty which contains the so-called league of nations is not founded upon any such principle. It contains within itself, as I shall later point out, the germs of wickedness and injustice that violate at the beginning the very principle that must control if we are to have a permanent peace. It lays the foundation for future war just as surely and certainly as the stealing of Alsace and Lorraine by Germany 50 years ago kept burning in the heart of every Frenchman a hope for the day when by whatever means necessary they might overthrow the rule of a foreign monarch and ally themselves again with the people of their own tongue.

The league of nations is only a part of the treaty. It contains in itself many objectionable features, but even if we were

willing to accept it in its present form we could not do so without accepting the entire treaty. I know that there is a serious objection against any amendment to any part of the treaty, because such a course means that the entire treaty must go back for consideration to the representatives of the various nations. But if the treaty must go back for revision it may just as well go back for a dozen amendments as for one, and since I can not vote for the ratification of the treaty unamended I shall therefore avail myself of every opportunity to vote for any amendment that, in my judgment, improves it, whether it be that part of the treaty providing for a league of nations or any other part. The league of nations part of the treaty was given to the world before the balance of the treaty was drafted, and since that is the part in which the people of civilization were the most interested they have not given attention to many of the other things that the treaty contains, and there are millions of people now who do not know that in order to obtain the league as provided for in the treaty we must agree to many other stipulations and agreements that are abhorrent to every man's sense of equity and justice.

I desire, Mr. President, to be constructive in my criticism. I do not want to tear down an edifice without suggesting, at least, something to take its place, for the object to be accomplished is well worthy of the consideration at hand. I desire, therefore, before I take up the criticism of the treaty which I intend to make, to briefly outline what I believe ought to be included in a treaty providing for a league of nations which, under existing conditions of civilization, we can have a reasonable expectation would receive the approval of mankind. In trying to reach an agreement we ought to approach the subject with an open mind. We ought to free ourselves, as far as possible, of all prejudice and feeling of self-glorification. This applies both to the individual and to the Nation. We should realize that no agreement on any great question in the history of the world has ever been reached except on the basis of sacrifice and compromise. We ought always to keep in mind that the one object in view is the abolishment of war. If we look over the history of the world and observe the paramount causes of wars in the past, it will not be very difficult to discover the things that must be accomplished in order that war may be avoided in the future.

DISARMAMENT.

Standing out prominently among the things that have caused war in the past is the question of armament. Without armament built up in times of peace, the danger of war would not only be lessened but to a great extent abolished entirely. If armament is dangerous to the peace of the world, then why not abolish it? This course, however, requires concert of action. So long as one great nation is building immense fleets of battleships and dreadnoughts, every other nation is compelled to keep somewhere in the same class; and thus we soon have a race between the leading nations of the world to see which can build the greatest fleet of these weapons of human destruction. It is a historical fact that no nation that has kept on increasing its army and developing its navy has not finally found an excuse to use them in battle. I am not intending to discuss this particular subject in detail at the present time, but I only want to say in passing that the present war would have been avoided had Germany not been arming herself and preparing for it for the last 40 years. Article 8 of the pending treaty specifically recognizes the principle that peace can not be maintained without disarmament, but, in my judgment, there is no provision in the treaty anywhere that will bring about disarmament. If the nations which drew it were in earnest and meant to disarm, it would have been just as easy to disarm themselves by this treaty as it was to disarm Germany.

CONQUEST.

Another historical guidepost that leads to war is the conquest of one nation by another—the transferring of the people of a nation at the cannon's mouth, as though they were slaves and chattels. In the present state of human society it is universally condemned by all civilized people. The abolishment of conquest would go a long way toward establishing a permanent peace. It is not defended by any people or nation, and the constitution of a league of nations should contain an agreement that no nation would under any circumstances engage in conquest or add to its territory in any way except by the consent of the people transferred. The compact should go a little further, and provide that no nation would ever recognize the transfer of a people from one nationality to another without their consent.

SECRET TREATIES AND SECRET DIPLOMACY.

The compact for a league of nations should require that all international business should be done in public. Legislatures and parliaments transact their business in the open, where the common citizen can look on and study every step of legislative progress. The laws that govern the people and which the peo-

ple must obey must be enacted in public and enforced in public, and yet the same nations that follow this wholesome rule in their internal affairs violate it entirely when they are negotiating with other nations. The light of publicity is one of the greatest specifics for governmental ills, and its helpful influence applies with equal force to international matters. Secret diplomacy and secret treaties are admitted everywhere to be among the greatest evils of the world. Treaties become the supreme law of every land, and yet many of them have been enacted and held in secret during all the centuries that have passed. They have been the direct cause of many wars and have had important influence in bringing on many other wars. No voice in all Christendom is to-day defending them. Then why not abolish them by international agreement?

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

The compact for a league of nations should also contain a provision for the arbitration of international disputes. The militarist goes on the theory that might makes right, and yet everybody knows that it is not only a false theory but it is an uncivilized and a barbarous proposition. What assurance can any nation have that a question settled on the field of battle by contending armies will be settled right? Not only does the settlement involve untold misery and suffering by millions of people, but when the decision is reached there is no assurance whatever that it will be either fair or just.

These propositions look simple. They are all practically self-evident. And yet, if they were established by an agreement among the leading nations, the permanent peace of the world would be practically assured. All the wars of the past between nations have been due to one or more of these causes. Personally I would be willing to include some other things in the league. I would not reject a league because it did not contain all of these, but we must take the world as it is and not as we wish it. If the establishment of these four propositions that I have named will bring about a permanent peace, then why not confine our energies, at least for the present, to their establishment. To include more is to invite opposition that may endanger the success of the entire undertaking.

Disarmament is recognized as necessary for permanent peace. Conquest is known to be wrong both in principle and in practice. Secret treaties and secret diplomacy create international suspicion, jealousy, and injustice; and arbitration of disputes between nations is only following out the principle of justice that is applied to the individual all over the civilized world.

The constitution for a league of nations ought not to include anything that is not absolutely necessary to carry out the object of the compact. The few things which I have enumerated are recognized to be the principal causes of all the wars of history. It might safely be said that every war of the past between established civilized nations would have been avoided had these enumerated propositions been recognized and observed.

AN INTERNATIONAL ARMY AND NAVY.

I do not believe it is practical or possible or even desirable that there should be established by any compact an international army or international navy. Human nature will have to change before it is possible for an army of one nationality to be used and handled at will by the government of another nation. For the same reason the so-called international police force will be a practical impossibility. Moreover, there is no necessity for any international force of this kind. If the world would abolish secret diplomacy and secret treaties and conquest and would disarm, there would be nothing for an international army or navy to do, even if it were practicable or possible to have an agreement that would provide for it. There have been many instances in the past where great powers have submitted great questions to international arbitration, and yet there is not an instance in history where any civilized nation failed to carry out in good faith the judgment of such a court. It is hardly conceivable that a civilized nation would take such a course. Such a nation would at once become an outcast in civilization, and if disarmed she would be harmless and sooner or later compelled to submit to the judgment of the arbitration tribunal. And if the international agreement provided for an economic boycott of such a nation, it could not long exist without compliance with the judgment.

SOVEREIGNTY.

I have no sympathy with the argument that by entering a league of nations such as I have outlined we would thereby surrender our sovereignty. Complete liberty of action would, of course, be modified and circumscribed by the constitution of the league; but this is true of every agreement in civilization, whether individual, state, or national. Absolute freedom in any civilized society can not be had, and the assertion and attempt to practice such a freedom is anarchy. The only man

who has complete personal liberty is the barbarian living entirely alone in the woods. Every law enacted by every legislature in Christendom circumscribes freedom of action. Human society is built upon the principle that we must surrender some of our individual freedom for the benefit of the whole. This is true of every individual contract. It is true of the most sacred contract known to man—the marriage relation. The 13 sovereign States had to surrender some of their sovereignty when they formed the Union. Our Government never entered into a treaty with any nation on earth without surrendering to the extent of the terms of the treaty some of our sovereignty. And here again we are met with the same proposition that I have before asserted—that in the formation of the proper kind of a league of nations there is no new principle involved. It is only the application of well-recognized principles to international relations.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

I do not agree with a large number of my colleagues in regard to the desirabilities of excepting the Monroe doctrine from the application of a league of nations. If we get the right kind of a league of nations, we thereby abandon the Monroe doctrine, and we ought to be glad to do it. We get something better for it. If conquest is abolished, if disarmament takes place, and secret treaties are no longer made, there is no further excuse for the existence of the Monroe doctrine. It never would have been promulgated had there been no secret agreements, secret treaties, or standing armies. The object of the Monroe doctrine was to prohibit conquest upon the Western Hemisphere by nations of the Eastern Hemisphere. If conquest is abolished, then the Monroe doctrine falls. It is replaced with something that applies to the whole world rather than to only a part.

ENTANGLING ALLIANCES.

It is claimed by some that the entering into any kind of a league of nations involves us in entangling alliances, particularly with Europe. I am as anxious as anyone to keep my country out of entangling alliances, and I am in favor of a league of nations such as I have outlined, because I believe it will keep us out of entangling alliances. We are in entangling alliances now. Under the old system we have been unable to avoid them, and it is sufficient answer to this criticism, it seems to me, that our Army is at this very moment standing guard along the Rhine. The world is much smaller than it used to be. The invention of steam, the telegraph, telephone, flying machine, and electrical appliances, have brought the nations of the earth much nearer together. Whether we wish it or not, we are next door neighbor to every nation on earth. We can not avoid international contact, even if we desired to do so, and one of the principal objects of the league of nations would be to prevent entanglements and thus save not only our Nation but all the nations of the earth from getting into them.

PRESENT TREATY.

I have thus briefly outlined what in my judgment ought to be included in a league of nations. I know that no man can get just what he wants, and I would be willing to take less or accept more, so long as the bounds of reason were not surpassed. Moreover, I would be willing to resolve every doubt in favor of the approval of any treaty providing for a league; but we have before us a treaty containing not only a provision for a league of nations, but a re-marking of many of the international lines of the world. And we are asked to accept it in its entirety, without change or modification. It transfers from one nationality to another hundreds of thousands of people. It remaps the entire world. It contains many things outside of the provisions for the league itself that shocks the sensibilities of justice and right. Among these, standing out prominently, is the transfer of a great portion of the Chinese Empire to Japan.

Section 156 of the treaty provides that all the rights, privileges, and possessions of Germany in China shall be turned over to Japan. The practical effect of this provision is to give Japan control over the Chinese Nation and to turn over to her the control of more than thirty-six millions of the Chinese population. Japan is given railroads, mines, submarine cables, together with the right and privilege of exploiting, all free, without compensation, and without limit. There is not a word anywhere in the treaty of Japan, under any circumstances, ever being required to turn anything back to China. It must be remembered that Germany had no right in China that any honest man was bound to respect. What rights she obtained there she obtained at the cannon's mouth because China was unable to defend herself.

It must be remembered, too, that China was one of our allies in the war against Germany. She rendered valuable assistance and sent 300,000 of her people to France, where they were engaged in the necessary work of constructing fortifications, and so forth. She turned over to the allied nations a large number

of German ships that had been interned in her waters. The men China sent to Europe, while not equipped with guns and armament, were sent into the most dangerous zones. They worked under the direct fire of German guns, and when the correct statistics are obtained there is no doubt whatever in my mind but what the figures will show that China lost more men in killed and wounded on the field of battle in this war than did Japan. China not only furnished many German ships and hundreds of thousands of men for the allied cause, but she contributed in a liberal way from her meager savings to the various other war activities. When in America we were making the famous united war-work drive for funds, to be contributed for the work of the Y. M. C. A., the Red Cross, and the Salvation Army, China was asked to contribute \$100,000. In answer to this call made by America, in a drive in China lasting two weeks, she contributed \$1,300,000, and, as showing the class of contributors to this fund, it is interesting to note that in one Chinese city alone there was contributed 240,000 pennies.

She did everything that an unarmed nation like her could possibly do in carrying on the struggle. She demanded no indemnity, no pay; but at the peace council she asked that the property stolen from her by Germany should be returned to its rightful owner. No nation had a representative at that peace council with cleaner hands than did China. Practically all the other great nations, except ours, were asking for indemnity or the transfer of sovereignty from some other nation. Of all the allied nations against Germany, Japan was perhaps the only one that made any financial gain out of the war. She had no right to the Shantung Peninsula of China than would America have had to demand that Alsace and Lorraine be transferred to her. It is no argument to say that Japan drove Germany out of China. It would be just as logical to say that America drove Germany out of France; that American soldiers recaptured portions of Alsace and Lorraine, and that therefore these territories should be turned over to American sovereignty. Germany had no legal title to a foot of land in China. This is conceded by everybody. No one has yet defended her course. In the case of Alsace and Lorraine, it might even be said in favor of the German Government that these Provinces were transferred to Germany 50 years ago at the end of a bitter war, and that they were part of the indemnity that the victor had a right to demand of the vanquished. But even this argument, unreasonable as it is, can not be offered in favor of giving Shantung and other portions of China to Japan. When Germany took this property from China there had been in reality no contest between the nations, but, like a highway robber, she stole into the harbors with her ships and compelled the Chinese Government to submit.

Every voice in Christendom cried out aloud that France, in the settlement of this war, should be entitled to the return of Alsace and Lorraine. For the same reason and by the same logic civilization ought to have demanded that the property which Germany stole from China should be returned to China. Moreover, when Germany compelled China to surrender portions of her territory it was stipulated in the treaty that was then forced upon China that under no circumstances should Germany be allowed to transfer any of this property to any other nation without China's consent; so if we want to be so cruel and unreasonable as to recognize Germany's title we must take it as a whole, and if we do, then the peace conference had no authority, either in justice or in law, even under their own interpretation, to violate the provisions that required China's consent to any transfer of these concessions to any other power. This action of the peace conference violates every principle of honesty and justice. It is a betrayal by the allied nations of a friendly nation. It turns over innocent millions of people to the rule and control of their worst enemy. Anyone believing in the principle of self-determination of people must blush with shame at this outrageous procedure. China is helpless, it is true. She can not defend herself. She ought to be protected by her friends, but it seems that she was at the mercy of her enemies and they failed and refused to extend to her the mercy that every victorious soldier ought to be willing to extend even to an enemy. She was betrayed by her own friends, and her people have been denied the right to govern themselves and the nation left in the control of the last nation on earth that China would have selected to control her had she been given a voice in the decision of her own destiny. And all this done by those whom she trusted, those in whom she confided and placed her trust, those for whom she shed her blood and sacrificed the lives of many of her people, her comrades in arms in a common cause. One of the most pitiable spectacles in the history of the world is the picture of poor, weak, down-trodden China pleading before the great world tribunal for justice—yes, for mercy—pleading to be saved the humiliation of

turning over 36,000,000 of her people, her industries, her holy land, the sacred dust of her ancestors, to the control and government of the one nation of all the earth she feared the most. China had reason for fear. She had been cruelly punished by Japan before. She had been treated by Japan the same as she had been treated by Germany. She had at her own door an illustration of what could be expected when the Japanese were given power to rule over a foreign people. She had seen Japan cruelly and unmercifully take possession of her neighbor, Korea. She knew that at this very time Japan was doing everything within her power to blot out every vestige of Korean literature and history. She knew that Japanese soldiers and Japanese officers had cruelly murdered innocent Koreans who were guilty of only one crime—that of loving their country. She knew that women and children had been murdered in cold blood. She knew that every Korean official had been forced out of office, and that from bottom to top the Korean Government was ruled by the Japanese. She knew that private residences all over Korea were searched for books and literature, and wherever such things were found they were burned, in order that the rising generation might have no opportunity to learn the history of their own country. She knew that the Korean language was being supplanted by the Japanese language, and no place in all the Empire was a Korean school permitted to exist. As between German rule in China and the Japanese rule that she had a right to expect she would have no hesitancy in welcoming back the Hohenzollern. As between German rule in China and Japanese rule in Korea she knew that even the Kaiser's control, wrong and unjust as it was, was a bright and shining light compared with what she could reasonably expect from Japan.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photograph of a dead Korean citizen. This was given me by Mr. S. A. Beck, who for 20 years has been a missionary or an agent of the American Bible Society in Korea. He returned to this country only last month, and he stood at the elbow of the man who snapped the kodak when this picture was taken. This poor Korean has one ear cut off. His face is smashed almost into a jelly. He has 28 wounds on his body, every wound given by a Japanese official or soldier; and of what was he guilty? What was the charge? He was unarmed, innocent, engaged in no attempt to do anything unlawful; but in the exuberance of his patriotism he had been guilty of crying aloud, "Hurrah for Korea," and for that he was run down, mutilated, punished, and finally killed. It is only one instance of what is almost a common occurrence in Korea.

I have here a copy of the report made by the Presbyterian Church of America on conditions in Korea, printed in the New York Times of July 13. I shall not attempt to read this entire report, but I wish that every citizen of the United States, and particularly every Senator who must soon pass upon the proposition whether he will turn China over to these same people, would read it. I wish every member of that church all over our land might read this official report by the missionaries of that church. In their introductory they say:

Many of these reports are repulsive in the extreme, and our readers' blood will boil with indignation, as ours has who have witnessed these things. We make very few comments, therefore, and leave the facts to convey their own lesson. Were the conditions as they actually are to be fully reported, the report would be extremely long and too horrible to relate.

They go on to tell of the tortures—the means that are used—not against people who are committing crimes, not against men who have been adjudged guilty of any charge or any offense, but men and women who have dared to say that they loved their country. Many of these punishments are inflicted for the purpose of extracting confessions for the purpose of getting evidence from the men persecuted against missionaries in order to drive the Christian missionaries out of Korea.

They hang men up by their fingers until the joints separate. They brand the flesh with red-hot irons. They have all manner of means to torture. In many cases it is for the purpose of securing statements from the victims implicating Christian missionaries, and, of course, it is only a question of time until any confession desired is extracted from the unfortunate victims.

This Mr. Beck, who is a Methodist minister, told me he had seen hundreds of Koreans—men, women, and children—run down by officers on horseback, clubbed by Japanese policemen, beaten by soldiers, pounded into insensibility, stabbed with bayonets, and cut up with swords, all because the innocent people joined in a parade in honor of their own country. They were unarmed, harmless, and not even charged with any crime or misdemeanor.

I have had this same man, who spent 20 years in Korea, describe to me things that he saw with his own eyes on the

public streets that are so horrible that it does not seem possible that anyone can believe them.

Now, this Presbyterian official report goes on. I want to quote a little from it. In these punishments that are inflicted they eventually get any kind of testimony they want. Everybody knows that if you commence to torture a human being you can eventually get anything from him that you desire, and they keep on with the torturing until they get it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is the Senator going to incorporate that report in his remarks?

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to doing so.

Mr. McCORMICK. I hope it will be done.

Mr. NORRIS. Here is one instance where they tortured a man, giving an instance of it. This Presbyterian missionary report says, speaking of a man who had been mutilated and whom the narrator saw 33 days after it occurred, when he was in the hospital still alive, with his entire body sore, all battered nearly to pieces, and, as he said, it was almost a revelation that he was still alive:

I saw one sear on the upper part of the leg. It had been seared, some 5 inches in length by a red-hot iron. Of these he bears four—

And so on.

Speaking of another case, they use this language:

This case is not an isolated one. Scores, hundreds, of similar cases could be cited and fully substantiated. Every police station is a veritable hell on earth. Every human refinement in brutality is known there, and such brutality is perpetrated as would blister the tongue to utter.

Another quotation:

Occasionally instead of imprisoning the men they are let off with only 90 blows of the bamboo rod, and that this is no light matter you may well imagine. No man could endure it all at once, so the 90 blows are administered 30 per day for three successive days. A large number of cases coming to the private hospitals are of men who have been thus beaten until they are nearly done for.

Now, I want to read from another part of this same report, and I wish the Senate would listen. You who have daughters and admire them, you who have wives and love them, you who have mothers and revere them, listen:

The examination of women who have been arrested for activity in the independence movement is the most disgraceful and humiliating possible. It will have to be remembered, however, that the Japanese feel no shame when nude in the presence of the other sex. On the other hand, the Korean and the Chinese women have the same feeling of delicacy as Europeans. They feel intense shame when seen by another. The Japanese know this, and so when they put Korean women into the question box—this, mind you, is before they are condemned at all—they are stripped absolutely naked. They are stripped not after they go to the room where they are questioned but in their rooms of confinement, and that by gendarmes.

From here they have to walk across an open court, where they can be seen by anyone who pleases.

Some women who tried to cover themselves had their hands tied behind them. One Bible woman had her arm wrenched out of its socket by this process.

Mr. President, as I said awhile ago, they are particularly anxious to drive Christianity out of the land. I have had explained to me by this missionary from Korea how in a village near Seoul the Christian men were all commanded by the soldiers to go into their own church, and when they got in the soldiers commenced to fire upon the church. Anyone coming out was killed. Then they set fire to the church and burned it and all the men in it. This Presbyterian report refers to an instance of that kind. The missionary had a conversation with a Korean that I want to read. The missionary says:

What is that smoke? Korean.—That is a village that has been burned. Missionary.—When was it burned? Korean.—Yesterday. Missionary.—How was it burned? Korean (glancing around fearfully).—By the soldiers. Missionary.—Why? Did the people riot or shout for independence? Korean.—No; but that is a Christian village.

He goes on with this same Korean and discovers that he lived in the village, and asked him how it happened he is still alive, and the answer was:

I am not a Christian. Only the Christians were ordered to gather.

Mr. President, I wish the Christian people of America would note that all the sacrifices which they have made in Korea now if this treaty goes through, all that they have made in China, or every missionary that has gone there to set up a church and preach the doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of the lowly Nazarene, are all in jeopardy.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. In this connection it is worthy of recollection that 1 of the 24 demands made upon China by Japan in 1915 was that Buddhism should be taught in China without restriction or limitation.

Mr. NORRIS. They will do in China like they are doing in Korea. Every book in Korea, every magazine, every paper, every history is being destroyed. The soldiers search the private rooms of the people to get them, in order that they may blot off the face of the earth every vestige of Korean history, which every student knows goes back many centuries, long before the Christian era. These men are just as proud of their country as we are of ours.

But it is going further even than that. These missionaries say that the one particular thing that the soldiers and the police are always trying to find out, whenever they resort to all manner of torture, is in order to get evidence against the missionaries. These are the questions that they put to them. If they raise the flag of Korea, they try to get them to admit when they are dying with torture that some missionary prompted them to do it. It is the Christian religion that is going to be blotted off the face of the earth over there. They then resort to various schemes, charging that the Christians have done the damage and committed the depredations. I will just read a little in this Presbyterian report on that score. This is taken from the pastor of the church at Tyungju:

On April 8 the gendarmes came to the newly built church in this city and gathered the furniture and mats together and set fire to them. Then they put out the fire. The next night a large pile of combustible material was heaped upon the pulpit and set on fire.

They could prove that these soldiers put out one fire. They were careful not to prove that they set the fire which they put out. The next night another fire was started. A deacon of the church rang the bell, and a few Christians came together and put out the fire. The next morning the police commanded the Christians who had houses near the church to move away, the pretext being that they had set fire to the church. Then they moved away, and after they were gone, on the next day, combustibles were put about the church soaked with coal oil and then set on fire. Then the soldiers rang the bell, but nobody came. There was not anybody left to come, and the church and everything burned up. I presume that the records of the Japanese soldier show that the Christians set fire to their own church, and that the first two times the soldiers put out the fire, but that they were unable to do so the third time.

And all this we are asked to approve by a ratification of this treaty. We are now expected to add to this international crime by giving senatorial approval to this unjust judgment. I am as anxious as any man on earth to bring about a fair and honorable league of nations; but if you permitted me to write the constitution of the league and make of it what in my judgment would be a model, and coupled with it the approval of this rape upon China, I would decline. We can not build a temple of justice upon a foundation of sand. We can not build an international tribunal founded upon the betrayal of any people, however weak. Sooner or later such a structure must crumble and decay. Every guidepost of history points to the futility of such attempts made by man. A century ago the avaricious kings of Europe divided up Poland. And yet the spirit of Poland lives; and even now, at the close of this great world struggle, the voice of humanity cries aloud that Poland shall be resurrected. Fifty years ago Germany wrung from France, after a bitter contest, the beautiful Provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The world stood by. It realized that an injustice was being done, but no nation felt warranted in interfering; but when the world struggle came, when this great war began, there came from all over the world the universal cry that Alsace and Lorraine should be restored to France. These lessons of history teach us that we can not violate the laws of God or nature without eventually suffering the penalty. And whatever structure we build, however powerful we may be when we build it, founded upon such an outrageous and unjust judgment, it will, in God's own time, bring about its own destruction. We are only planting the seeds of future wars that will be just as certain to come as the universal law of creation remains intact.

THE PROCEDURE AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

As indefensible as is the judgment rendered at the peace council in transferring Chinese property and sovereignty to Japan, the procedure by which this unjust judgment was brought about is still more reprehensible and indefensible. It is difficult for a fair and reasonable mind to comprehend how these great powers could treat an allied nation with such unmerciful cruelty and lack of justice. But this judgment can be understood better when we observe the procedure by which it was brought about. As unjust and as bad as the judgment was, it fades into insignificance when compared with the secret agreement by which these great powers agreed to divide up the spoils of victory and turn China, one of their own friends and allies, without her consent and against her objection, over to her ancient enemy.

When it became apparent that the United States was about to enter the war, it was feared that China would follow her.

In fact, there is but little doubt but that China would have gone into the war long before she did had it not been for the influence of Japan in keeping her out. England, France, Russia, and Italy all wanted China to get in, and while the matter is shrouded somewhat in mystery there can be but little doubt to the unprejudiced mind that it was Japan, working through her allies, that prevented China from declaring war against Germany. Her object in this was obvious. If China joined in the fight against Germany, she would have a right to appear at the peace conference and to have her wishes and her rights taken into consideration in agreeing upon the terms of peace. Obviously Japan preferred that China should have no place at the peace table, but Great Britain and France were anxious to have China join the allies in order to get the German ships that were interned in Chinese waters. Everybody knows that the question of transportation was one of the vital things of the war. The destruction of ships by submarines had made it necessary for every allied nation to bend every energy in the building of ships in order to replace those that were lost. It was the one thing that for a time appeared to be the greatest cause for fear that Germany might win, and therefore the question of securing these German ships was exceedingly important and valuable. An unbiased mind might even question whether Japan was acting in good faith in thus interfering with the acquiring of ships that might spell the difference between victory and defeat. It seems almost incredible that at this critical stage any allied nation, anxious for the allied cause to win, should take any steps, especially of a selfish nature, to prevent the acquiring of additional ships; but when it became apparent that America was going into the war, and Japan, realizing that this would probably also bring China in, she systematically took up the question with the great powers. She entered into a secret agreement with her then allies—England, France, Italy, and Russia—which provided that after China had become a belligerent, and had given her blood and treasure to bring victory, when these allied powers met around the council table they would divide the spoils of victory among themselves and rob China of her birthright by turning her over to the tender mercies of Japan.

On the 27th day of March, 1917, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs at Tokyo approached the British ambassador located at that place with a view of bringing about such an agreement with the British Government. The British minister cabled to his government at London, and after receiving instructions from his government wrote the Japanese Government as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Tokyo, February 16, 1917.

MY DEAR EXCELLENCY: With reference to the subject of our conversation of the 27th ultimo, when your excellency informed me of the desire of the Imperial Government to receive an assurance that on the occasion of a peace conference His Britannic Majesty's Government will support the claims of Japan in regard to the disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung and possessions in the islands north of the Equator, I have the honor, under instructions received from His Britannic Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, to communicate to you the following message from His Britannic Majesty's Government:

His Britannic Majesty's Government accede with pleasure to request of the Japanese Government for an assurance that they will support Japan's claims in regard to the disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung and possessions in the islands north of the Equator on the occasion of the peace conference, it being understood that the Japanese Government will in the eventual peace settlement treat in the same spirit Great Britain's claims to the German islands south of the Equator.

I avail myself of this opportunity, M. le Ministre, to renew to your excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

CONYNHAM GREENE,
His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador.

To His Excellency VISCOUNT ICHIRO MOTONO,
His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs.

On the 21st day of February, 1917, the Japanese Government replied to this communication of the British Government as follows (omitting formal part):

The Japanese Government is deeply appreciative of the friendly spirit in which your Government has given assurance, and happy to note it as a fresh proof of the close ties that unite the two allied powers. I take pleasure in stating that the Japanese Government, on its part, is fully prepared to support in the same spirit the claims which may be put forward at the peace conference in regard to the German possessions in the islands south of the Equator.

While the Japanese Government was waiting for a reply from the British Government it proceeded also to negotiate with the other allied Governments. Its message to the French ambassador at Tokyo was signed by the Japanese foreign minister and was as follows:

The Imperial Japanese Government has not yet formally entered into conversations with the entente powers concerning the conditions of peace I propose to present to Germany, because it is guided by the thought that such questions ought to be decided in concert between Japan and the said powers at the moment when the peace negotiations begin. Nevertheless, in view of recent developments in the general situation, and in view of the particular arrangements concerning

peace conditions, such as arrangements relative to the disposition of the Bosphorus, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles, being already under discussion by the powers interested, the Imperial Japanese Government believes that the moment has come for it also to express its desires relative to certain conditions of peace essential to Japan and to submit them for the consideration of the Government of the French Republic.

The French Government is thoroughly informed of all the efforts the Japanese Government has made in a general manner to accomplish its task in the present war, and particularly to guarantee for the future the peace of oriental Asia and the security of the Japanese Empire, for which it is absolutely necessary to take from Germany its bases of political, military, and economic activity in the Far East.

Under these conditions the Imperial Japanese Government proposes to demand from Germany at the time of the peace negotiations the surrender of the territorial rights and special interests Germany possessed before the war in Shantung and the islands situated north of the Equator in the Pacific Ocean.

The Imperial Japanese Government confidently hopes the Government of the French Republic, realizing the legitimacy of these demands, will give assurance that, her case being proved, Japan may count upon its full support on this question.

It goes without saying that reparation for damages caused to the life and property of the Japanese people by the unjustifiable attacks of the enemy, as well as other conditions of peace of a character common to all the entente powers, are entirely outside the consideration of the present question.

A few days later the French Ambassador replied to the Japanese foreign office, as follows:

The Government of the French Republic is disposed to give the Japanese Government its accord in regulating at the time of the peace negotiations questions vital to Japan concerning Shantung and the German islands in the Pacific north of the Equator. It also agrees to support the demands of the Imperial Japanese Government for the surrender of the rights Germany possessed before the war in this Chinese Province and these islands.

M. Briand demands, on the other hand, that Japan give its support to obtain from China the breaking of its diplomatic relations with Germany—

They had not been broken at the time this correspondence took place—

and that it give this act desirable significance. The consequences of this in China should be the following:

First. Handing passports to the German diplomatic agents and consuls.

Second. The obligation of all under German jurisdiction to leave Chinese territory.

Third. The internment of German ships in Chinese ports and the ultimate requisition of these ships in order to place them at the disposition of the Allies, following the example of Italy and Portugal. According to the information of the French Government there are 15 German ships in Chinese ports, totaling about 40,000 tons.

Fourth. Requisition of German commercial houses established in China; forfeiting the right of Germany in the concessions she possesses in certain parts of China.

Upon receipt of this communication the foreign minister of Japan, on behalf of Japan, promised compliance with the request of the French Government contained in this letter. Similar negotiations were entered into with similar results with Italy, although the negotiations with Italy took place in Rome and not in Tokyo. Similar agreement was also made with Russia, and it must be remembered that at that time Russia was still in the war, and it was anticipated that at the close of the war she would have a place at the peace table.

It is thus clearly disclosed that while these leading Governments of the world were inducing China to get into the war, in order that they might secure her assistance and particularly that they might be able to get possession of the German ships interned in China's harbors, they were secretly plotting among themselves as to her destruction as soon as she had complied with their wishes and the war was over. This procedure applies with particular emphasis to the agreement between Great Britain and Japan. After they had gotten out of China all that was possible then it was agreed that at the council table England should assist Japan in her claim against China, and to compensate England Japan agreed to assist England in getting all the German possessions south of the Equator. It must be remembered, also, that these agreements were made in secret at a time when all the nations entering into them were proclaiming to the world that secret treaties and secret diplomacy must be forever abolished. Poor, weak China was not told by these great statesmen representing the highest civilized nations of the earth, that after she had assisted to the limit of her power in overcoming Germany, she herself should be pounced upon and her territory turned over to other nations, the same as it was proposed to turn over the territory of the common enemy. In all the annals of history I do not believe there is recorded an instance of a more disgraceful and dishonorable agreement to carve up the territory not of an enemy but of an allied friend. Let us bring this proposition home to ourselves. Suppose it had developed at the peace council that England, France, and Japan had secretly agreed that when peace was declared New England should be taken away from the United States and turned over to Canada until such time as Canada saw fit to relinquish her claim. Would there have been found anywhere beneath the folds of our flag a single individual who would have demanded that the Senate should approve a treaty

of peace containing such a provision? Would any such agreement be considered, even if the treaty contained a provision for a league of nations that it was alleged would bring eternal and permanent peace to all the world? Would any American citizen have given a moment's thought to any other provision of the treaty, however valuable or however just? And it would have made no difference had the war been waged so fiercely that during its progress New England had been captured by the Germans, so that the treaty might have truthfully said that the possessions of Germany in New England should be turned over to Canada. Under these conditions is there an American citizen who loves peace so much that he would be willing to take it at such a sacrifice? And would we be any more liable to submit to such an outrage if during the war our Navy had been destroyed, our armaments all obliterated, and, like China, were in a helpless condition? Would the particular wrong be made any the more bearable or sufferable because we should happen to be in a weakened and crippled condition? Would it make the act just or excusable simply because we did not possess the power to resist? And are not the rights even of poor China as sacred to her as our rights are to us? And are we going to condone this outrageous perversion of justice simply because it is practiced upon some one that is weak? Are we going to give our official approval to this robbery of China simply because the principal actors in the cruel farce are the leading nations of the world? Can we afford to purchase peace at the sacrifice of honor? Such action would give the lie to every principle or declaration of justice that was ever made by our Government or any of our allies during the progress of the war.

It gives official approval to secret diplomacy after we and our allies have publicly proclaimed to the world that secret diplomacy was dead. It gives a death blow to the great doctrine of self-determination, for which it was claimed that this great war was, in part at least, fought and won. It writes falsehood upon every declaration that has ever been made by anyone during the progress of this war, that we must fight until we could have a peace that would give protection to the weak as well as the strong. It brands all the claims and protestations of our civilization with hypocrisy and nullifies every instinct of the human heart for justice and equality. And, Mr. President, these same nations are going to be the leading spirits in the league of nations that we are to set up by this treaty. If this is a sample of the justice that will come out of such a league, then what can weak and unarmed nations expect? This secret agreement entered into by the leading nations of the world, and the unjust judgment that followed it, shocks the sensibilities of those who honestly want to bring about a league of nations and causes them on the very threshold to question and to doubt. Have we not a right to expect more of our boasted civilization? If the greed and avarice shown by the nations that have entered into this secret agreement to despoil China are to control the league that is to be set up, then God help the poor and weak who approach that throne expecting justice. And if we approve this wicked decree, is it any defense to say that we were the only member of the court that was not bribed? Can we shift the responsibility from our shoulders by claiming that we took no part in the procedure that took place in the darkness by which China has thus been despoiled? This judgment can not become operative without our official approval. If we ratify this treaty as it stands, we approve not only the judgment but the reprehensible method by which it was brought about; and if we thus approve it with our eyes open, do we not thereby become a party to it? Is there any possible gain that can come to us or to our Nation that will be sufficient to compensate us for taking such a step? Is peace so sweet or life so dear that we can afford to perpetuate them by giving our official approval to an act brought about by a procedure that would be disgrace to the civilization of the wild man and the barbarian?

If this treaty as it stands becomes operative, and later the 30,000,000 of Chinese in Shantung should rebel against the rule of the Japanese, and then if the balance of China should go to the assistance of their own brethren in attempting to overthrow the unlawful and cruel rule of a foreign government, then under section 10 of the league of nations as it now stands it would be our duty to contribute American lives and American blood on the battle field to assist Japan to retain her power. And are these suppositions unnatural or improbable? What other thing could we naturally expect than that these Chinese in Shantung should rebel? What would be more natural when they do rebel than that the balance of China should go to their assistance? We ought to remember that our approval of this unjust and wicked document may require the services of our sons on the battle field under the Japanese flag to maintain her supremacy in China's holy land.

This treaty should go back, and I believe if the American people could have an opportunity to see all the vice that it contains and were able to express their patriotic sentiments, it would go back practically by a unanimous vote. When the honest citizens of Great Britain, of France, and of Italy realize the injustice that it contains they will unite with us in demanding that it be rejected. In face of what we hope and pray will be a new era in civilization the world can not afford to take such a backward step. We can not build our temple for the future upon such a crumbling foundation, and I do not believe that the Senate of the United States will take the step that is here demanded of it, which, in my judgment, would constitute the blackest page in our Nation's history and be a constant reminder to those who shall follow us that we failed to do our whole duty. If we desire to build a temple upon whose front we can truthfully inscribe the divine motto, "On earth peace, good will toward men," the foundation must be constructed according to the golden rule, upon the principles of justice and equality, and not based upon the doctrine of hypocrisy and greed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record the report from the Presbyterian Mission, from which I read some extracts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1919.]

HORRORS IN KOREA CHARGED TO JAPAN—PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH MAKES OFFICIAL REPORT OF MURDERS AND TORTURES—CHRISTIAN TOWNS BURNED—INVESTIGATORS TELL OF AT LEAST 30 MEN DONE TO DEATH IN A CHURCH.

"A report of alleged Japanese atrocities in Korea was made public yesterday at the headquarters of the Presbyterian Church in America. It is a result of investigations by representatives in Korea of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, following the imprisonment of some of its missionaries by the Japanese authorities. The information from Korea was transmitted by such means that it escaped the Japanese censors.

"The report, which is several thousand words in length, is described by the Presbyterian Church in its introduction to the presentment as follows:

"The American papers are already full to overflowing with the reports of atrocities in Korea. The origin and causes of these are of immense importance, but in this article these subjects can not claim our attention. Knowing that another Belgium is on the world's hands, it becomes necessary that the facts be stated by some one, and that these be held to form the basis of constructive reformation later on. This article is written with this idea in mind.

"What is reported here can be duplicated in scores of places in Korea, and some of the reports thus far received are even more harrowing than the ones we report. But, as they have not been definitely established by competent witnesses, we omit them but confine ourselves strictly to incidents which are known beyond the shadow of a doubt to be true.

"Many of these reports are repulsive in the extreme, and our readers' blood will boil with indignation as ours has who have witnessed these things. We make very few comments, therefore, and leave the facts to convey their own lesson. Were the conditions as they actually are to be fully reported the report would be extremely long and too horrible to relate."

TORTURE OF POLITICAL SUSPECTS.

"Preliminary police examinations of Koreans suspected of complicity in the revolutionary movement are said in the reports of the investigators to include 'every human refinement in brutality,' men being beaten to death and women subjected to nearly every possible form of shameful treatment. Milder punishment, it is said, included 90 blows rained upon the prisoner's body with a bamboo rod, and the administering of many boot kicks, at the end of which the victim, if he survived, was sent almost lifeless to a hospital.

"One such victim, 'a slender, timid, Christian youth,' 19 years old, employed by a shoemaker, was arrested with a wealthy Korean, both charged with circulating the Independent News, a revolutionary publication."

HORRORS IN KOREA.

"The report proceeds:

"At police headquarters they dealt with the wealthy man first, telling him that if he would disclose who was distributing the secretly published sheet, the Independent News, they would set him free. He told, and the shoe boy, who was his tool, received punishment for both.

"Word came to me soon after this that our shoe boy had been frightfully beaten and would die. I was very greatly concerned about it. Thirty-three days later I was meeting with some women of the Fifth Presbyterian Church * * * and heard that the boy was in a dying condition in the public

hospital. As there had been no report of his death in the meantime, I had hoped he would escape at least with his life. I went to see him yesterday at the hospital.

"The only reasons which can account for his being there are either because the police did not want him to die on their hands or wanted to prolong his torture, for he is miraculously recovering. I entered by the main office, presented my card, and was shown to his room without any police interference, at which I was greatly surprised. I went in and saw a very sallow, sick boy—what must he have looked like five weeks before? I knew that God had surely sent me to him. I was there nearly an hour and a half. After his story I sang several hymns, had prayer with him, and departed for home.

"The following is his story. * * * It certainly is a miracle that he is living. On the day following his arrest he was questioned about complicity with the Korean independence movement.

THE ORDEAL OF A YOUNG PATRIOT.

"On refusal to reveal aught of the affair he was subjected to six hours of "examination" spelling constant torture, for his arms were put into rings above the elbows until the upper body was greatly distorted—the usual preparation for beating. Beating and kicking were then administered until he fell fainting to the ground. He was given cold water to drink, and water was poured over his body to bring him to again. Then more questions were piled, but the same refusal to reveal facts followed, also physical collapse.

"I saw one scar on the upper part of the leg. It had been seared some 5 inches in length by a red-hot iron. Of these he bears four. I saw the dead-skin line of the welts that had been raised by blows on his hands. One hand, he said, had been swollen to twice its normal size. Two joints of one finger and two finger ends showed plainly the tale was all too true. His head is still sore from the blows received.

"Shortly the doctor called on his regular rounds and seemed to take great pains in examining him. Turning to me, he said his chest and lungs were better. Was it exposure to cold that made his chest sore? No. He pulled his clothing down to examine further, and I saw that his whole abdominal region had been involved. A wound—whether by bayonet thrust or doctor's incision I do not know—seemed to be healing. The doctor began by pressing, but after 33 days this boy was unable to endure even a slight touch from chest to groin and from hip to hip. An ice bag was at his head for fever, body was quite wasted to bone, and he was only just able to raise himself to a sitting posture.

A MISSIONARY UNDER SUSPICION.

"During the four days of torture and the subsequent two days of suffering at the police station a physician had been admitted to see him only three times. He was expecting to die and begged them to kill him. But God had another plan. After 20 days in the hospital he has hopes of recovery.

"I rode in a ricksha, as I had little time, delivered him some eggs, apples, milk powder, a clean cover for his pillow, with clothes, and the transformation was wonderful. For the clothes he had on had the marks of his experiences from the first. A Korean nurse was in attendance during the visit; the reason I understood later.

"His soiled clothes were rolled up ready to take along. We had prayer, and I rose and was leaving the room when a coolie confronted us outside the door. He spoke to the sick boy and said: "You must wait; you must not go." About me he said I should go to see somebody. Imagine, please, what they were trying to work up against me—that I was trying to get the boy away in my ricksha. I was in for arrest.

"He calmly strode into the main office. Over a half hour elapsed ere anything happened. Imagine my terrible plight! I had purchased fish for dinner, and guests were expected. There really was little time to spare. However, I dispatched a woman with the fish and a note, and sat down to wait in patience, for the last thing to do in the Orient is to get flustered.

"I certainly was the object of much attention. I wondered how many soldiers would come to take me away, and whether they would let me ride or make me walk. Finally my amused meditations were broken, not by khaki-clad armed soldiers but by a plain-clothes Japanese detective, who had come in to interview me. I told him all that I knew, and he was exceedingly mild toward me, when I tell you he was the one who at the police station almost tortured our shoe boy to death. He is the acknowledged spy on all foreigners and the official torturer of our schoolboys.

"The interview was brief, he saying that the sick boy was yet a prisoner, and hereafter if I wished to visit him I must first apply to the police for permission. It was like thin ice, seeing

how far I could go without breaking through. I was really disappointed, for I thought I was going to get inside the jail for sure. A community phone call had been sounded, announcing that I was missing, and a member of the legal committee was about to set out for the police station when I returned.

"We foreigners enjoy little freedom, nor are we safe under the present Japan and United States of America agreements. Ask Uncle Sam.

MANY CASES OF TORTURE.

"This case is not an isolated one. Scores, hundreds, of similar cases could be cited and fully substantiated. Every police station is a veritable hell on earth. Every human refinement in brutality is known there, and such brutality is perpetrated as would blister the tongue to utter. Men are known to have been beaten to death, and their bodies handed over to their relatives to bury. Others have been beaten until crippled for life, and then released, to be a burden on their families until the day of their death. * * *

"Note that the shoe boy had been in the hospital 33 days already when the interview was held. When will he be ready for trial? Still, it is understood that he is to receive nine months in the penitentiary. This was practically decided by the police officers even before being brought to trial. The court simply goes through the form of trying him, and sentences him as the police have suggested.

"Occasionally, instead of imprisoning the men, they are let off with only 90 blows of the bamboo rod, and that this is no light matter you may well imagine. No man could endure it all at once, so the 90 blows are administered 30 per day for three successive days. A large number of cases now coming to the private hospitals are of men who have been thus beaten until they are nearly done for.

"All this in a land which boasts before the world of its thoroughly acquired modern civilization, an associate of the great allied nations of the world. * * * When will such mockery as this end and men be called what they really are?"

REVOLTING TREATMENT OF WOMEN.

"The following is a signed statement by an American residing in Korea, dated April 22, 1919:

"The examination of women who have been arrested for activity in the independence movement is the most disgraceful and humiliating possible. It will have to be remembered, however, that the Japanese feel no shame when nude in the presence of the other sex. On the other hand, the Korean and Chinese women have the same feeling of delicacy as Europeans. They feel intense shame when seen by another.

"The Japanese know this, and so when they put the Korean women in the question box—this, mind you, is before they are condemned at all—they are stripped absolutely naked. They are stripped not after they go to the room where they are questioned, but in their rooms of confinement, and that by gendarmes.

"From here they have to walk across an open court, where they can be seen by anyone who pleases. Sometimes they are accompanied by a Japanese female and sometimes not. It might also be said that each time they wash they have to take off the thin kimono which they wear in prison and stand naked before others while they wash.

"Their arraignment is before men, of course, and the chief part of the examination is to make the pain of the humiliation just as intense as possible. Unmarried girls, as well as Bible women who have lived in homes of refinement and who have been used to nothing else than the courtesies due their sex, are thus outrageously treated. They are called bad women in the most revolting terms just because they have shouted in the street, "Hurrah for Korea!"

"Some women who tried to cover themselves had their hands tied behind them. One Bible woman had her arm wrenched out of its socket by this process. * * *

"But this is not all. Some were kicked in the stomach and otherwise roughly treated by these fiendish men. Some of us have heard terrible tales about the German treatment of women in Belgium and France, and, though the awful depths have not yet been reached here, we see the training of the same school.

"In one section of the country the women are not safe in their homes during the day. They spend the daytime in the hills and come to their homes only at night.

"The Japanese are great sticklers for the truth when it comes from others. So let others read and understand. We have here sworn statements from women thus treated, which can be produced when needed."

CHRISTIAN VILLAGE WIPED OUT.

"Christians murdered and burned by Japanese soldiers."—Japan Advertiser, Tokyo, April 29, 1919.

"The following is the most terrible story yet verified. The American vice consul and the British acting consul, as well as many others, have personally visited the scene and have protested against such acts. The governor general was compelled to admit the offense, and the following article gives the general fact:

"Statement of H. H. Underwood, a missionary resident in Seoul, as to trip to neighborhood of Pal Tan, market town in country of Buwon-Kyongki Province, April 16:

"Party left Seoul about 9.30 a. m. by writer's auto and proceeded to Pal Tan by way of Buwon and Osan, a distance of slightly over 46 miles in all. About 2 miles before reaching Pal Tan a large cloud of smoke was seen rising from behind a market town. The car was stopped for lunch here, and the writer strolled over to a near-by cluster of houses and, finding a farmer, engaged him in conversation. After a little preliminary talk the following took place:

"H. H. Underwood. What is that smoke?

"Farmer. That is a village that has been burned.

"H. H. U. When was it burned?

"F. Yesterday.

"H. H. U. How was it burned?

"F. (glancing around fearfully). By the soldiers.

"H. H. U. Why? Did the people riot or shout for independence?

"F. No; but that is a Christian village.

"After lunch we drove to the town, leaving the car, as it was impossible to cross the stream at the entrance to the town. We walked past the police station, which is situated where the two main roads entering the town meet. A file of soldiers of the Seventy-eighth Regiment was standing outside the station. As we were passing a Japanese policeman came out and demanded where we were going, ordering us into the station. We entered as two Japanese officers got up and left. We all noticed their shoulder straps, which are red, with three stars. This, I am told, is the badge of first sergeant. The policeman who had ordered us into the station shouldered a carbine and followed the officers. In a moment we saw them setting off on the road to Nemyang, with the policeman in the lead.

"Mr. Curtice then presented his card to the officer and conversed with him in Japanese. I do not speak Japanese, but I know a little, and followed a large part of the conversation. After chatting about the roads, bridges, mutual acquaintances in Seoul, etc., Mr. Curtice asked about the fire. The chief said there had been a small fire, but that it did not amount to much.

ONLY "A LITTLE DISTURBANCE."

"When asked about the disturbance he said that there had been a little disturbance in that part of the country, but that it was now over. Some more general conversation took place. Mr. Curtice asked if rickshas could be procured in the town, as we would like to make a little excursion to see the fire. The chief asked, "What fire?" Mr. Curtice said the near-by one, and that we would probably like to take a little ride of 3 or 4 miles in the country.

"The chief seemed a little surprised, but said, "Yes," and sent a policeman with us to the ricksha stand, where we hired three rickshas and set out. The village from which the smoke was rising was not more than a mile from town, and after a short ride we left the ricksha and walked around the foot of the hill on the sides of which the village had been.

"Our estimate and the statements of the Koreans that the village had consisted of about 40 houses agreed. Only 4 or 5 were left standing. The rest were heaps of smoking ashes, with flames still visible here and there. We saw groups of women, children, and old men sitting on the hillside above the village watching the ruins in dumb despair.

"We walked the entire length of the village, and about halfway up saw the corpse of a young man terribly burned, lying just outside a building which we learned later had been the church. This body was photographed where it lay.

"After going the length of the village we came back along the hillside and called to a man sitting in one of the groups mentioned. He held his head in his hands and said that everything he had and all the results of years of hard work had gone. I consoled with him and asked when the fire occurred. He said, "About this time yesterday (2 p. m.)."

"H. H. Underwood. How did it start?

"Korean. Why, the soldiers.

"H. H. U. Were many people burned or hurt?

"K. The soldiers killed all the Christians who were in the church.

"H. H. U. What were they in the church on a Tuesday afternoon for?

"K. The soldiers came and ordered all the Christians to gather in the church.

"H. H. U. Were there women in the church, too?

"K. No; the women were told not to come.

"H. H. U. Well, after the Christians gathered in the church what happened?

"K. The soldiers fired on them and also used their knives, swords, and bayonets, and then set fire to the church.

"H. H. U. How did the houses catch?

"K. Some caught from the church and others on the other side, where the wind did not carry the flames, were set on fire by the soldiers.

"H. H. U. How is it you are alive?

"K. I am not a Christian, and only the Christians were ordered to gather.

"H. H. U. Your house was also burned?

"K. Yes; there are the ruins [pointing].

"H. H. U. But there are a few houses left. How about those?

"K. Those stood by themselves, and after the fire had been set in several places if the rest did not catch they did not set them on fire.

THIRTY KILLED IN A CHURCH.

"H. H. U. About how many were killed in the church?

"K. Thirty.

"I then left this Korean and walked over to another group. Here there were several young women with babies and old women and a young boy of about 19 or 20. These people were Christians and knew Dr. Noble, of the North Methodist Mission, in whose district this church was. I asked the same, or nearly the same, questions, and got the same answers as to time, method, number killed, the setting of the fire, etc.

"I asked the young man how he happened to be alive, and he replied that he had been away gathering wood on the hills and had returned at night to find all his male friends and relations dead and buried under the flaming ruins of the church.

"The people were absolutely destitute. Here and there a few household goods had been snatched from the flames, but none of the little groups seemed to have more than a very small bowl of rice or grain for all the survivors, and they said that most of them had lost their grain seeds for the coming year and everything, including domestic animals, on which they were very dependent.

"We bid good-by to the group, after taking their picture, and walked through the village to one of the houses that was still standing. Here one owner was a very old man, who said that his house stood alone and had not caught fire and had not been set because he was not a Christian. His account of the event tallied in every way with that of the others.

"He also did not know how many had been killed, but put the number at about 30. After taking a few more photos we returned to the rickshas and started back to the town. The ricksha coolies offered to take us to another place about 3 miles farther on, where the same thing had happened a few days before. They volunteered that about 15 places had been burned, and in most cases Christian centers.

"This tallied with other stories and with reports brought up to Seoul to the missionaries in charge of the district. The soldiers had been brought in by auto about 2 weeks or 10 days before, and the first villages had been burned at that time. The chief of police had reported that the trouble had been over for some time, and we heard no accusations that there had been any violence on the part of the Koreans in this village which we visited; but the police claim that violence had been committed in other places. We bade good-by to the police and returned to Seoul by auto, as we had come, reaching Seoul about 5.30.

"The governor general says that the lieutenant in charge of the troops who committed this crime has been punished. We should like to know whether this means removal from his present post and promotion to a higher position somewhere else.

THE BURNING OF TYUNGJU CHURCH.

"The burning of the Christian church buildings seems to be a favorite pastime of the military, including the police, at present. Attempts are made to prove that the burning is done by nonbelievers who are disgusted with the Christians and are anxious to get rid of them. But the evidence is too strong against the military that they themselves are inciting the people to do the work, while they usually take a place in the background and are righteously indignant when the crimes have been committed. Yes; there are cases, as you can see from the article on the murder and burning of Christians above, that they have done the deeds themselves.

"We give two accounts herewith of the burning of the church at Tyungju, North Pyengen Province. The one is by

the Seoul Press, a government-controlled paper, and the other by the pastor of the church, an American missionary, who saw the church and made careful investigation. The reader is at liberty to draw his conclusions:

"Christian church burned. (Seoul Press, April 13, 1919.)

"On Tuesday, at 6 a. m., fire broke out in a Christian church at Tyungju, site of a district office in North Pyengen Province, and the whole building was reduced to ashes.

"The loss is estimated at 10,000 yen. It is suspected that some Koreans, detesting the purposeless agitation, have been driven by their bitter indignation to commit incendiarism at the expense of the church."

"The following is from the pastor of the church:

"Burning of Tyungja church. On April 8 gendarmes came to the large, newly built church in Tyungju city, gathered the mats and other furniture together, and set fire to them. They also put out the fire. The Christians have been bending every energy to the building and paying for this building.

"On April 9, at night, as on the 8th, a large pile of combustible material was heaped upon the pulpit and set on fire. A deacon of the church rang the bell and a few Christians came together and put it out. The next morning the police commanded the Christians who had houses near the church to move away, the pretext being that they had set fire to the church.

"On April 10 combustibles were put all about the church and soaked in coal oil and then set on fire. They also rang the bell, but no one came, and the church burned to the ground.

"On April 11 the wife of the pastor and some of the church officers were called up and rebuked for burning the church. They also gave them a lecture on what low-down rascals the Christians were, stating that not a single person would come out to help put out the fire. As a matter of fact, any appearing on the streets at night are severely beaten and otherwise mistreated."

"There was a statement in the Japanese press that Christians set the church on fire to show their disapproval of the leaders of the church in the independence movement. No comments needed.

"In conclusion, after publishing what are alleged to be violently anti-American articles from certain Japanese newspapers, the report of the Presbyterian investigators says:

"It is unnecessary to say more. These articles speak for themselves. The reader can judge of the attitude of the press when the Government permits such stuff to be printed. As the press always is under the censor here, when such stuff is printed the Government becomes morally responsible. The truth is prohibited. Falsehoods and libels are allowed. Such a course of action only endangers the relations of the Governments concerned."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the war has sapped the foundation of society. It came very near to destroying all hope for lasting peace for this generation of men. In a world broken away from the fundamental principles of right and justice for the protection of humanity, where no court of common arbitration exists, where the selfish passions and desires of men are the ruling cause that shapes their course, where no ideals of equity and fair play are established as a guide to human conduct, the sword—the sword alone—must and will shape the destiny of suffering humanity.

Must we continue to make the sword the sole arbiter of justice and right, or has the time arrived in the progress of the world's civilization when the sword shall become merely the instrument by which the decrees of nations, founded on established principles, shall be enforced? An ever-increasing sense of public justice, sustained by the ever-strengthening power of freedom of thought and action among the masses of men, is crystallizing into a universal sentiment in civilized nations for the recognition of a court of final judgment to guide the future destiny of the world, rather than leave the decision to the blood-stained decree coming from the battle field.

I am forever opposed to war, except a war of defense. Peace should be the foremost policy of our country. There may be nations who in the past were forced to make war that they might live. Not so with us; our fathers gave to us as a sacred heritage the most wonderful country that has ever cradled a great civilization in the progress of the world. Great, fertile plains, capable of producing food for a population ten times larger than our own, mountains and hills holding in their everlasting embrace treasures of raw material such as the world knows not of elsewhere—coal and iron, lead and copper, gold and silver—with but few exceptions, every raw material that is needed to build the greatest industrial nation that the dreams of man can imagine. We possess a people who for industry, courage, and

virtue stand unrivaled on the globe. Within our borders we are a world to ourselves, possessing every attribute that makes man strong, great, and self-sustaining. We stand alone, the foremost Nation on our hemisphere, protected on all sides with natural barriers to defend us from the aggression of a foreign foe.

You may say: "Then, why should we become involved in an alliance that may drag us into the disputes, the disasters, and the dangers of other nations?" This was the doctrine our fathers believed in, and one that I am slow to yield. But we face a condition, not a theory. Since the foremost patriot of all the great men who have held allegiance to our flag advised his countrymen against becoming involved in entangling alliances the mind of man has invented, discovered, and perfected the railroad and the steamship, the telegraph and the telephone, the submarine and the aeroplane, the high explosives and the deadly gases. In Washington's time men voyaged across the sea for more than a month to reach the European shore; in our day men have flown across the Atlantic Ocean in 16 hours. Time and space have been eliminated. Dangers to our people and our Republic that were not dreamed of a century ago confront us to-day at our very doors, a threatening menace to our lives, our civilization, and our institutions. Shall we continue to dream of the ideals of the past, or meet as practical men the dangers of the future? For me there is but one course to pursue.

The era of territorial expansion has passed; the era of social development is here. We must face the conditions as we find them. Many of the difficulties of the past arose from the fact that the countries of higher civilization were becoming densely crowded, and those of more primitive life controlled large unoccupied areas, possessing vast natural resources. The instinct inherited from the tribal life of remote ancestors remained the governing cause that guided the course of nations long after it was repudiated as being unmoral in the life of individuals. For the last four centuries, the policy of most of the great nations has been to settle the waste places, and if it could be done without too much danger, to exploit the lands of their weaker neighbors. Force was, and continued to be, the foremost virtue of national life, until it took the combined strength of the world to destroy the last great monster, reared through a century of treason against humanity and imbued with the desire to absorb and destroy all other peoples of the world, their commerce, and their ideals, making the sword the sole arbiter of the destiny of man, and enthroning force as the ideal of modern civilization.

Has the suffering of the Great War taught us nothing? Must we lapse back to the barbarous national morals of the past, without an effort to reach out for a new ideal of national life that will make it as unmoral for a nation to murder, rob, and plunder because it has the power as it has been for an individual to do so? Has not the time come for the universal establishment of order and justice, the development of national resources for the benefit of all, the establishment of the freedom of the seas to the commerce of all lands, the repudiation of the grinding down of the weaker peoples of the earth, the restraint of international greed and monopoly by the enlightened nations of the world in a high court of good morals, and the destruction as a common enemy of any nation that hereafter claims the right to live by the sword? If this be true, then we must not close the book of the Great War without making an earnest effort to baptize anew the Old World into a new and moral life for national existence.

The most important treaty that has ever been negotiated is now pending before the Senate of the United States for ratification, amendment, or rejection. It purposes to end the Great War, to restore our country to peace conditions. It comes to us after many months of deliberation and consideration by ourselves and nations with whom we have been associated in the war. Its terms have been acceded to by the nations with whom we have been at war. It is not the product of the desires or the conclusions of any one nation, but it reflects the compromises that the compelling power of the world's desire for an early peace has forced the allied nations to accept and agree upon in order that the peoples of the whole world may hereafter pursue the paths of peace and abandon the pursuit of war. Under these conditions it can hardly be expected that the terms agreed upon will be entirely satisfactory to all the parties to the contract, and in some of its details it probably does not reflect the sentiments of any of them. The question that confronts the Senate is not whether the treaty reflects the views and traditions of the American people entirely, but as to whether, taken as a whole, it is best to accept it in its entirety and immediately end the period of the war, or as to whether some of its terms are so repugnant to the true interests of our people that we should reject the treaty by amendment or repudiation and endeavor at a later date to reopen the peace negotiations with the hope or expectation of improving the terms from which we desire to dissent.

The contract treats with the most momentous problems that have ever been dealt with at any one time in the world's history. The map of the world is to be changed. Old landmarks are to be destroyed and new ones erected. The governments of hundreds of millions of people are to be changed and re-established. The commercial and industrial life of the world is to be reorganized and readjusted. Great indemnities are to be exacted from the fallen foes, and restraints in armament, industry, and commerce placed upon them. These questions, and many others, were the burning issues that surrounded the peace table at Paris. They represented the future life of great nations and many peoples. They were the vital issues to be solved. They were questions of to-day, but most of these issues are not in close contact with the life of our own Nation. Although they may mean much to us in the future, their importance is not realized by the people of our country to-day. So far as I have heard, there seems to be but little sentiment, if any, reflected in the public prints and in the talk of men against the acceptance of the verdict of the tribunal of peace so far as it relates to these grave and important matters. The discordant thought of the people at home relates to a question of the future, and not to the issues of the present. The foremost question in the mind of America to-day is the future preservation of the peace of the world, and well may this be so. We were a peaceful, industrious Nation, living without the desire to despoil our neighbors, content within ourselves, seeking only after high ideals of justice and right in all the affairs of national life—patient to an extreme degree with those who affronted us, endeavoring always to keep the peace—and yet, without fault on our part, without the desire for war, a ruthless foe fired on our flag, sank our ships, and, without our having any opportunity to avoid it, drove us into the bloodiest war that the world has ever known. We were compelled to sacrifice many thousands of lives of our brave and gallant sons. In carrying on the war we have spent billions of dollars that will be a burden on our lives and our resources for more than a generation to come. We profit nothing as a result of the war, except that profit which comes to all men who stand courageously for the right and strike down the wrong—the profit that comes from the honor and respect of the peoples of the world. Well may we say, "Has the world gained anything by the destruction of the barbarous Hun, if the conditions that he created in this war may come again?" And, therefore, the question that is foremost in the thoughts of our people is whether or not it is possible for man to establish a rule of law and justice as a substitute for the rule of power and force.

From these sentiments has come the desire for a league of nations, a coming together of the peoples of the earth to establish a high court of justice for the final arbitrament of the disputes of men that have heretofore carried their peoples to the battle fields of the earth. I hear no one dispute the fact that it is far better to settle national disputes by arbitration rather than by the sword, and it appears to me that the sole contention in reference to the approval of those clauses in the pending treaty of peace that establish a constitution for a league of nations is whether the proposed plan is strong enough in itself to accomplish the desired end, or whether the strength of the plan may lead to the destruction of national independence and interfere with the great principle of self-determination in the inner life of the nations of the world.

There have been many causes of war in the past, but the dominating causes of war among the great nations of the world have been the desire for the possession of lands and colonies, commercial concessions and expanded markets, the enlargement of national domain that appeals to the sense of greatness and power, and the desire of each particular nation to dominate and rule the internal affairs of other nations. These great causes of war may be paraphrased in two words: "National selfishness." Until the civilization of the world is prepared to dethrone its own selfish ideals and to recognize the rights of other peoples, the inherent causes of war must continue to exist.

I am not prepared to say that the adoption of the present treaty carries within itself the elimination of these causes of war or that in the end there will be no more wars; but I do say that within the folds of this treaty we find an agreement between the great nations of the world that will probably in the future carry the questions of national dispute to a court of final arbitration, and in many, if not most, instances avoid the horrors and injustices of war. For my purposes in this argument it is not necessary to refer to the clauses affecting the organization of the league of nations. The league is a form of government, and every Government must have defined the details of its organized life and the principles for which it was created. In passing, let me say that I do not regard the or-

ganization of the league as a supergovernment. No supergovernment could exist without power to maintain itself. Within itself the league has no power to levy taxes, and without revenue a government can not long exist. The league has no power to raise armies and navies, and without military forces it can not defend itself. It is therefore not a supergovernment, but a federation of States, dependent for its existence upon the future voluntary acquiescence in its continued life of a few of the great nations of the world. Within the terms of the contract is carried the provision that any of the signatory powers to the created organization may withdraw upon giving two years' notice. The announcement of withdrawal from the compact by either France, the United States, or Great Britain would at once destroy the binding force and moral power of the league in the world's affairs. So, with the right to withdraw, I feel that there is no need to fear the dangerous surrender of any of the fundamental principles and rights of the American people. Therefore I am willing to take it and try it and hope that from the seed that is planted to-day, in its fruition the final peace of the world may be found.

I am more interested in the principles enunciated in the clauses relating to the league of nations than I am in the powers given for its government, for on these principles the future life of the league must depend. I would have been glad to subscribe to a contract that would have arbitrarily limited the armaments of the world. Such a decree is not found within the contract, but there is a covenant that seeks to keep the peace of the world, that authorizes the executive council of the league to consider how much the present armaments of nations should be reduced, and submit its conclusions to each member nation of the league, which may then agree or not agree to accept the recommendation. In other words, each nation will finally agree to the limitation of its own armament and, having so agreed, must keep it as long as it remains a member of the league. This is not a strong or a definite agreement, but out of its terms I am hopeful that there will come a gradual disarmament of the world, the lifting of the burden of the preparation for war from the shoulders of striving humanity, and the greater inducement to settle disputes through the high court of arbitration rather than the decision of brutal force.

Another vital principle that we are asked to agree to is that all of the members of the league shall submit differences between them that are not capable of being settled by negotiation before a tribunal to be composed of judges or arbitrators agreed to by them, and after entering into the arbitration they are required to abide by the award. Should either party to the dispute refuse to agree to arbitration, the executive council of the league is required to mediate between them and endeavor to secure a voluntary settlement of the questions involved. If it fails in this, the council is to report on the facts. If the report is unanimous, the member nations are to carry it into effect. If it is not unanimous, it is to be published, and there the matter will end, so far as the league is concerned, except that the moral suasion of the verdict rendered may have the power to avoid the arbitrament of arms.

Another principle involved that will aid the world in guarding against war is a clause in the covenant which provides that the nation shall not begin war until three months after the arbitration award or the recommendation of a compromise. This undoubtedly will operate as a great restraint against war. It is not at all probable that nations involved will not allow the three months' limit to expire before attempting actual hostilities under any circumstances and take the chances of bringing on their heads the condemnation of the other nations of the world. Three months' time for consideration and reflection, with the world looking on and discussing the problems involved, is more likely to point the road to peace than to find the way to war.

The greatest principle of the league tending to keep the peace of the world is that which declares that "the high contracting parties to this treaty shall undertake to respect and preserve against external aggression the political independence and the territorial integrity of every member of the league." Most of the wars that have been waged in the ages that have passed have had as their governing cause the desire to conquer and control another people, or to expand the territory of the country that is the aggressor in the war. Prevent the incentive for wars growing out of a selfish desire for aggression, as the overweening force of this covenant will do, and few actual causes of war will remain that can not without difficulty or danger be submitted to the high court of arbitration.

I have therefore reached the conclusion that, as a Nation, we will be better off in the world's affairs by accepting the terms of the organization of the present league of nations than to destroy all opportunity for the establishment of a world's tribunal of peace by the rejection of the treaty at this time, and I

shall therefore cast my vote against all amendments proposed to the treaty that may delay its ratification and send it back to Paris for further delay and deliberation. I shall vote for the ratification of the treaty as a whole, believing, as I do, that although it may have imperfections within its folds, and it may not express in its entirety the high ideals of everlasting peace, yet that it is a long step in the right direction. It is the building of the road that leads away from the war and the cruelties of strife. It is the starting of the highway of peace, that may ultimately carry us to the establishment of the high principles of equity, right, and justice between all men of all nations.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the subject of a league of nations.

Assuming that it were possible to form a league of nations which would—

First. Insure to the peoples of the world a lasting peace, by the prevention of wars between nations;

Second. Preserve the sovereignty of the citizens of the United States so that they would at all times be free to decide questions affecting their own nationality and inherent rights, such as control of immigration and the levying of proper tariff rates; and

Third. Leave exclusively to the decision of the United States Government the policies which it could adopt, from time to time, for the control of its foreign affairs and in dealing with other nations—

Such a league would appeal to me as one to which the United States should subscribe as a member.

The covenant for a league of nations as incorporated in the treaty of peace being negotiated with Governments of the Central Powers and other nations does not properly provide for any one of the three conditions above named; therefore, in my opinion, it should not be approved by the Senate of the United States without first making certain reservations or modifications which would cure these defects.

The suggestions for amendment proposed by Hon. Elihu Root appear to cover what is needed to put the covenant in acceptable form, although further changes may be deemed advisable. I believe that the thorough discussion by the Senate of the proposed league and of the treaty of peace is a national duty, with a view to seeking, fairly and impartially, the most practical methods to be employed for the maintenance of a lasting peace. While it is probable that the problems involved can be worked out in a satisfactory manner, which I hope will be done, and the approval of the Senate given, I am strongly opposed to the acceptance of the league in its present form.

It has been my endeavor to give earnest consideration to this most important subject with an open mind and without reference to party affiliation. My strong feeling has been that the interests of the United States are paramount and must be given precedence, while the affairs and claims of foreign nations are only entitled to take second place, in the consideration of the subject by the Senate.

ADDRESS ON MILITARY JUSTICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to present and have referred to the Committee on Printing an address delivered by Lieut. Col. S. T. Ansell on June 26, 1919, at Bedford Springs, Pa., before the Pennsylvania Bar Association, having reference to military justice. It is with a view to having it printed as a public document that I ask to have it referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The address will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Capper	Harding	Nelson	Spencer
Chamberlain	Harris	New	Stanley
Colt	Harrison	Newberry	Sterling
Cummins	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Swanson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Owen	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
Fall	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Ransdell	Warren
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Robinson	Watson
Gay	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	McCormick	Simmons	Wolcott
Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

A WORLD CONSTITUTION.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I read this morning an editorial written by Mr. C. P. J. Mooney, the editor of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., entitled "A world constitution." It strikes me as one of the most intelligent and thorough discussions of the necessity of a league of peace that I have read for some time. I therefore desire to have it inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

A WORLD CONSTITUTION.

"Unless the Senate of the United States ratifies the treaty of peace as it is now written the Great War will have been fought in vain.

"The part the United States took in the war will be a waste of human life, property, and suffering unless there follows something by which the dangers of recurring wars are reduced.

"The thing offered is the league of peace. No document is more simple. It is clear and definite. It seeks to bring about a concert of action between all of the great powers of the world, under which disputes between nations and quarrels between races may be adjusted without a resort to violence.

"The main points of the opposition urged against the league by our Senators and their supporters are similar to the main objections to the Constitution of the United States when it was up for ratification. There were many brilliant men, most of them erratic, who are yet famous in the history of America, that opposed violently what we have come to regard as the greatest guarantor of our national life and our personal liberties.

"The Constitution of the United States brought 13 independent States together. For many months several States held out against ratification, and it was finally adopted after an exceedingly close vote in New York. This victory in New York was due to the work of Alexander Hamilton.

"Our Constitution has survived the changes of more than a century. It survived the great Civil War.

"When the Constitution was adopted it provided for an adjustment of disputes between States and for a settlement of differences between citizens of various States through a Supreme Court. This great court has developed every principle in the Constitution which had to do with the right and liberty of the citizen. It has rendered decisions which have been obeyed without question. In other countries such decisions might have caused a change of government or a resort to violence. To the glory of the Supreme Court of the United States, no citizen and no State have ever been deprived of a privilege or a right which justly belongs to him or it.

"The league of nations is a world constitution. Its supreme object is the liberty and peace of peoples. Going into it, no nation will be deprived of any present right or privilege.

"There are other things in these days than brute force by which adjustments are made. Order and peace can be maintained by good sense and common sense. When the peace league has made a decision the common sense and good sense of the world, of the members of the league, behind that decision will ordinarily cause its enforcement.

"England and the United States have for the last hundred years adjusted many sharp disputes by arbitration. The United States for a hundred years has brought about peaceful settlement of acute questions with Russia, Germany, Italy, Japan, and France. It is true we had a war with Spain, but that war was for the liberation of a people.

"So, if two nations agree by a set of treaties to adjust questions peacefully, may not a combination of nations, by one general treaty through one great clearing house, also adjust their differences?

"Suppose the United States, after the armistice, had quickly withdrawn from the conference, and suppose that nothing except individual treaties had been made with Germany. There would have been merely a recess in war.

"For 50 years Germany has worked hard for an idea that the German people have held for 1,200 years—since the days of Charlemagne. That idea is that the Teutonic race is superior to other races, and therefore should dominate the world. Germany has been controlled by this idea for 1,200 years and has been feverishly working to put it in force for 50 years. Germany will not give up the idea within six months.

"It is necessary, then, for the other nations to hold together under some sort of compact until this thought is extirpated from the minds of Germany and the Teutons come to realize, as Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Americans do, that they are not by nature superior to other people and have no right superior to other people.

"The world can not stand for a hundred years such a war as we have gone through. Even now we realize the damage that has been done to the established order. The waste of this war must be repaired. England, France, and Italy must be rehabilitated. We must have a season of peace to readjust our own affairs. In the league of nations there is the only hope of directing the mind of the world into peaceful channels.

"During the war we demanded that certain subject people should be made free. These new nations are like toddling infants. They must be held by the hands until they are able to walk alone. If they are now left to their own devices, it would have been better for them had they not been given a vision of liberty.

"And yet some Senators say that we should live to ourselves. The logic of this is that we should trade only among ourselves; that our people should not go through the lanes of the world. We should become as remote from the rest of the world as an interior country of Asia. We should close our minds, ears, and eyes to all things outside.

"It was the lack of isolation that helped us win our liberty. The first act of the United States after the Declaration of Independence during the War of the Revolution was an 'entangling alliance' with France, and owing to that 'entangling alliance' we and the French were able to beat the British.

"If we are to remain a civilized and enlightened people we must undertake the duties that civilization and enlightenment impose upon us. At first the cave dwellers sought to live without entangling alliances. Human society could not begin to form until after the cave dwellers changed their viewpoint. China and Korea sought this method. Look at them now. Japan abandoned seclusion.

"The Senators say the Monroe doctrine is threatened. These Senators to be logical should, if they oppose the league of nations, also demand the abrogation of the Monroe doctrine.

"The Monroe doctrine was fought by a great force in America because 'it committed the United States to an interminable series of foreign wars.' The Monroe doctrine is intact with us as a member of the league of nations. The league of nations is a development of the unselfish principle of the Monroe doctrine, and applies it to the entire world.

"The opposition of the Senators is partisan and personal. The Members of that body have fooled away months in discussing the treaty of peace, even before it was before them. They want to continue to fiddle while this country is threatened with conflagration. The people should demand that they ratify the treaty, and ratify it at once, and then that they try to develop their intellects so as to grasp some of our tremendous domestic problems.

"The country is running away with itself. We are in a hectic stage of getting money without working for it. We are in the midst of an orgy of speculation and gambling. The necessities of life, more abundant than they have been for a generation, are mounting sky-high in price. Labor is discontented, and has a right to be. Instead of organization there is disorganization. The laboring man and capitalists are both getting big profits, but these profits are apparently on paper. In many cases they do not purchase those things necessary for the well-being of the individual.

"We should have a program of legislation for the happiness and the good of people.

"Heretofore our legislators have measured prosperity in dollars and cents. It is a false measure.

"Legislation should tend toward making living conditions tolerable for every man who has the will to labor.

"The Senate should ratify the treaty at once and then give attention to these things. For there are certain evil forces, material and spiritual, at work in this country which will destroy us unless they are overcome.

"A majority of the American people are behind President Wilson. He tells them that 'the treaty and the league promise peace to the world.'

"Those who have taken part in the great struggle, and their fathers and mothers, want that thing done which will reasonably guarantee against a repetition of the bloody transactions of the last four years.

"The treaty is an assurance of peace. A rejection of the treaty is a bid to war, to anarchy, and to chaos."

ALLEGED GERMAN-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to call up Senate resolution 110, of which I gave notice yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments were, in line 1, after the word "be," to insert "and he is hereby"; in line 3, before the word "treaty," to strike out "the" and insert "any," and after the word "treaty" to insert "purporting to have been projected"; in line 5, after the word "annexed," to strike out "and to inform the Senate whether such treaty has been abrogated under clause 2 of article 289 of the treaty with Germany or whether it is still in force and effect" and insert "together with any information in regard to it which may be in the possession of the State Department, or any further information concerning any negotiations between Japan and Germany during the progress of the war," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with public interest, to send to the Senate a copy of any treaty purporting to have been projected between Germany and Japan, referred to in the press dispatch hereto annexed, together with any information in regard to it which may be in the possession of the State Department, or any further information concerning any negotiations between Japan and Germany during the progress of the war.

"JAPAN AND FOE IN SECRET PACT—SOVIET GOVERNMENT MAKES PUBLIC TREATY BETWEEN NIPPON EMPIRE AND GERMANY.

"(By United Press.)

"BUDAPEST, June 20.

"The Soviet Government to-day made public in a wireless dispatch from Moscow the following version of an alleged secret treaty negotiated between Japan and Germany:

"First. Both parties undertake to lend a helping hand to the third treaty party (Russia) as soon as compatible with the world's political situation, for the restoration of her internal order, international prestige, and power.

"Second. Japan undertakes the granting to Germany of advantages resulting from the most favored nation reciprocity clauses of the existing Russo-Japanese treaty.

"Third. Japan undertakes to permit Germany to participate, in accordance with concessions embodied in this special treaty, in Japan's preferential treaty rights in China, the parties undertaking to exclude foreign powers (United States and Great Britain) from securing further concessions there.

"Fourth. Japan undertakes the safeguarding indirectly of Germany's interest in the forthcoming peace conference, striving for minimum territorial and material disadvantages to Germany."

The dispatch declared that the alleged treaty was negotiated by Oda, Japanese plenipotentiary, who arrived in Stockholm on October 18, 1918, to begin secret conferences with German Ambassador Lucius. The Bolsheviks claim that Oda transmitted to Tokyo secret German overtures for a separate peace.

"Oda and Lucius, agreeing upon the principles of a treaty, later went to Berlin to complete the draft, the Bolsheviks charge. The German Government approved the document, it was said, but the revolution rendered it impossible of execution.

"The alleged existence of such a treaty was first definitely asserted by Foreign Minister Tchitcherin in a recent interview with the United Press. The Bolsheviks' bitter opposition to the alleged treaty and their desire to make it public results, Tchitcherin explained, from the fact it could only become operative through their overthrow and the restoration of the Russian Empire."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I voted against a favorable report on this resolution in committee, but I do not propose to resist its passage at this time any more than to make a protest against resolutions of this kind, based on such a slender foundation and having the natural effect of indicating to a friendly country, an associate of ours in the war, that the Senate of the United States gives credence to newspaper reports of this character.

It seems to me that to ask the President of the United States in this public and official way whether he has information to the effect that Japan during the war negotiated with Germany with a view to making a separate peace is unworthy of the Senate. No possible good can come of it. There is no substantial foundation for believing that there was such a negotiation.

If the Senate of the United States or if the Committee on Foreign Relations desired to get any actual information it could have secured all the information by a private conference with the President that it can possibly secure by this open declaration.

I object to this resolution because it implies that those who introduce the resolution and those who pass the resolution give credence to the report that Japan took this attitude during the war. I think it is unjust, I think it tends to interfere with the friendly relations existing between the two countries, and I can see no possible good that can come of it.

I shall, however, not resist passage of the resolution because I realize that the votes are here to secure its passage, but I hope when the reply comes from the President it will be the last attempt that will be made by the Senate of the United States to go on a fishing excursion for the purpose of breeding trouble.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the information about negotiations of Japan with Germany was printed in a dispatch of the United Press which I appended to my resolution, but that is by no means the only information in regard to it. It appeared also in the Far Eastern Review. I have a memorandum here from the Far Eastern Bureau of New York which is engaged in the far eastern business, giving all the details, with which I do not

wish to burden the Senate. It does seem to me that where we are making a treaty which includes Japan and includes the gift to Japan of some 36,000,000 Chinese, which will tend to build up very much the Japanese power, we at least ought to know whether there is any truth in the very detailed statements which have been published both by one of the very great press associations and by the Far Eastern Review. For that reason the Committee on Foreign Relations reported this resolution of inquiry.

It has been stated that a copy of this alleged treaty is in the hands of the State Department and has been for some time. Of course it is entirely open to the President to refuse the information if he sees fit, but I think it is perfectly reasonable that we should know about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not like to let go without any comment the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts that this treaty involves a gift to Japan of Chinese territory with thirty or forty million Chinese—

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that treaty. I said the treaty that is before us involves a gift to Japan.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand; I mean the treaty that is before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if the Senator wants to discuss the Shantung provision now, it is open to him to do so, but I wish he would let us dispose of the pending resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am going to discuss it for a few moments, with the Senator's permission.

Germany, as the Senator very well knows, got her rights and privileges in the Shantung Peninsula by a treaty with China which was signed in 1898.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would tell the whole story about that treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me, I am going to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Begin with the missionaries who were killed and the German fleet that went there and extorted the treaty under the guns of the fleet.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I repeat that Germany got her rights and privileges in the Shantung Peninsula by a treaty which was signed in 1898. That was 21 years ago. When this war started Japan became a party to the war, and at the instance of the other nations involved in the war attacked Germany, then in possession of those rights and privileges and properties in the Shantung Peninsula, and by act of war Japan took those away from Germany in November, 1914. That was two years and a half before the United States entered the war, and it was two years before China entered the war.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to his colleague?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator believe that the treaty between Germany and China which he mentions was a treaty that was in force and that we ought to respect?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is the Senator's question and I will answer it in this way: I will say it was a treaty which was acknowledged by the whole world, including the United States, when Mr. Hay was Secretary of State.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, let me ask the Senator another question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was acknowledged under the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator acknowledges the treaty, then he acknowledges it in toto, does he not? Does the Senator acknowledge part of it and abrogate a part of it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have had nothing to do with the acknowledgment. I am reciting history. I am saying that Germany had a good title, as titles go, to the rights and privileges in the Shantung Peninsula, and that the United States officially, by the State Department when Hay was Secretary of State, acknowledged and recognized Germany's rights in the Shantung Peninsula.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; now, let us assume that. Take that just as the Senator has it. That treaty contained a provision that no rights given by China to Germany under it should be assigned to any other nation without China's consent. If the Senator accepts the treaty, he must take that provision with it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. China has consented.

Mr. NORRIS. By what authority did they give the rights of Germany to Japan without China's consent?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. China gave her consent by the treaty of 1915.

Mr. NORRIS. By the treaty that we have before us now?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. China gave her consent by the treaty of 1915.

Mr. NORRIS. With Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Which China made with Japan, in which China said that she would acknowledge and respect and accept any arrangement that Japan and Germany made with respect to the German possessions in the Shantung Peninsula.

Mr. NORRIS. That was a treaty which was made in 1915?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was.

Mr. NORRIS. It was like the other treaty. It was forced on her. It was absolutely forced upon her, and everybody knows it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not discussing how it was done; I am discussing the fact that China—

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is claiming that Germany's rights in China were by virtue of a treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. And while I do not believe Germany obtained any rights by that kind of a treaty, I am assuming now that she acquired just what the Senator claims; but that treaty itself provided that Germany should not assign any of those rights to any other nation without China's consent; and I am only contending that if you take the position that Germany did acquire any rights—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield to the Senator to make a speech.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the Senator has got to stand by all of it or none of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield further. My colleague imposes upon the privilege of interruption and takes the floor away from me.

It is true that the treaty of 1898 between China and Germany contained the provision that the rights should not be assigned without the consent of China, but China gave that consent by another treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. China did not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. China gave that consent by another treaty made in 1915; and that treaty can easily be put into the Record, if the Senator is not satisfied with my statement. So I say that the right which Germany had on the Shantung Peninsula was one which had been secured by treaty, and that that treaty was acknowledged and recognized amongst other ways by the United States in a note signed by John Hay, written on September 6, 1899, in which Mr. Hay complimented Germany for the liberal policy adopted with regard to certain customs collections in that Province.

Therefore, I repeat, that Germany's title has been acknowledged; it existed 21 years ago; and it has been acknowledged by every nation in the world. Whatever title Germany had was taken away from Germany by war by Japan two years and a half before we became involved in the war or had any right to say what Japan should do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And by treaty with China.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Therefore I object to the intimation of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that in the existing treaty now before the Senate a gift has been made to Japan of 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 Chinese people. As a matter of fact, Japan only secures rights, privileges, and concessions in the Shantung Peninsula, and the sovereignty over the Shantung Peninsula remains and rests in the Chinese Government.

Mr. President, that is not all. China gets something by this treaty which is greater than any asset she has heretofore had. China by the treaty now before the Senate gets the full benefit of article 10, which is so viciously attacked upon the other side. [Laughter upon the Republican side of the Chamber.]

Sensors laugh, but Senators know very well that in the past most of the nations of the world have despoiled China and have taken her territory.

Mr. LODGE. And they are doing it now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; Senators should know that under article 10 no further spoliation can occur. They know that there is an absolute promise that the territorial integrity and the political independence of every nation shall be respected.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is something that has not heretofore existed.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will suspend for just a moment. Senators who desire to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska must first address the Chair.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I understand the Senator from Nebraska to object to the language used by the Senator from Massachusetts in describing this transaction as a gift to Japan, and I also

object to that language; I think it is more accurately described as a bribe; and I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will accept that correction?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will not accept it.

I have not any patience with the crocodile tears that Senators are shedding over China. Senators now sit here and shed crocodile tears over China when in the past they have never raised their voices in the defense of China and protested against the spoliation of that empire. But here in this treaty, in the form of article 10, is a guaranty that in the future China can not be despoiled.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to his colleague?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not also true that the treaty between Germany and France by which Alsace-Lorraine was given to Germany was approved by the entire world; and does the Senator think, then, that the recapture of a part of Alsace-Lorraine by American soldiers would entitle the United States, under his theory, to have Alsace and Lorraine given to us?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, there are so many answers to that question that I hardly know how to take them up. The fact is that one of the objects of this war, admitted and proclaimed on the floor of the Senate, was to restore to France the territory taken away by Germany in 1871.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator permit another interruption?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. In the next great war one of the objects will be to restore to China what has by this treaty been taken away.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I do not know whether the Senator is any better prophet than he is statesman; I do not know whether or not that will be one of the objects of the next war; but I know that China is a beneficiary under this treaty. I know also that whatever title Germany had Japan acquired by right of war before we entered the war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And by treaty with China.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; and by treaty with China, of course. I have stated that—by two treaties with China.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I notice that the Senator from Nebraska—and I thought very gracefully—congratulated his colleague on the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], yesterday upon his eloquent remarks. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree with his colleague on the committee as to the construction placed upon article 10 by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not sure that the Senator from Virginia said anything regarding the construction of article 10 in the connection to which the Senator from New Mexico now refers.

Mr. FALL. Well, to sum up, I thought the conclusion of the Senator from Virginia was that we need not be frightened, for article 10 did not amount to anything.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator from Virginia said nothing of the sort. In my opinion, and I am sure in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, article 10 is one of the most, if not the most, important provision in the treaty for the purpose of preventing wars of conquest in the future. Under that article every member of the league agrees to respect the political independence and existing territorial integrity of every other member of the league.

Mr. FALL. Yes. It goes further than "respect"; it agrees to protect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. "Preserve" is the language.

Mr. FALL. "Preserve." How is that to be done, in the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is to be done as stated in the article. When there is danger or action indicating a war of conquest against any member the executive council is directed to advise and recommend to members of the league the action that they shall take to protect the threatened member.

Mr. FALL. There is nothing in it, then, that compels any action at all?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is everything in it which would appeal to sovereign nations like the United States to carry out the purposes of the article.

Mr. FALL. It does, then, convey an obligation? It either does or does not convey an obligation?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from New Mexico says so.

Mr. FALL. I ask the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It does.

Mr. FALL. Convey an obligation?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; it does convey an obligation.

Mr. FALL. Then, by agreeing to it, we are obliged to preserve the territorial integrity of the Japanese Empire with all of its possessions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; certainly.

Mr. FALL. So, being under obligation to do that, if Japan calls upon us to assist in driving the Chinese hordes away from Shantung, in the event the Chinese Republic undertook to recover Shantung—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator from New Mexico is entirely mistaken.

Mr. FALL. Then, under the Senator's construction, we would be obliged to send our boys there?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all. The Senator from New Mexico was never more wrong in his life than he is at this moment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will just bear with my ignorance and enlighten me, I will be very grateful to him, certainly, and I will make any promise if the Senator will merely inform me now what he does believe about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not going to make a speech at the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico. I have risen here for the purpose of resenting the statement that the United States and the other nations which are entering into this treaty are making a present to Japan. We are not making a present to Japan.

Mr. FALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are not giving a bribe to Japan.

Mr. FALL. I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are simply recognizing the facts of history and the facts of the present. The facts of history are that Germany had title and Japan took it away from Germany by war; that Japan holds what she has taken; and there is no present given her either in this treaty by one nation or by all of the nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. McCORMICK. How did Italy secure possession of Fiume, then, if not by an act of war?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That question is highly pertinent. The Senator from Illinois knows very well that all that territory is now under the jurisdiction of the conference at Paris to settle its disposition. There is no treaty in existence by which Italy claims possession of Fiume. Italy by the secret treaty which was in existence made no claim to Fiume. Fiume is one of the disputed territories under the jurisdiction of the council at Paris which is endeavoring, in the face of a very difficult race question, to decide what the disposition of it shall be. There is no parallel case between Fiume and Kiaochow.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator holds, then, that the United States is bound to observe those secret treaties?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the United States is not bound to observe those secret treaties. The United States has protested against them.

Mr. McCORMICK. The United States is bound to observe the published treaty, then, for the transfer to Japan of German rights in Shantung?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Ah, the Senator very well knows that those treaties are not only public but years ago were recognized by the United States under a Republican administration.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Nebraska does not follow me, I think. No Republican administration recognized any agreement under which the British Government expressed its pleasure in acceding to the Japanese demand for Shantung.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is now introducing foreign matters that I have not been discussing and that I do not propose to discuss. I am discussing the rights of Japan on the Shantung Peninsula, and I want to deny the intimation made by the Senator from New Mexico that Japan has secured or that Japan claims any rights of sovereignty over any territory in the Shantung Peninsula. She has railroad rights; she has mining

rights; she has commercial rights in Kiaochow. She has no rights of sovereignty, and this treaty gives her no rights of sovereignty.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. MOSES. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to state a few minutes ago that this action embodied in the treaty was to make the treaty conform to the facts as they existed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I did not fully say that; the Senator has changed it somewhat. I said that men recognize the existence of historical facts and present conditions in making treaties.

Mr. MOSES. And that this treaty in this instance was made to conform to that recognition?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I assume that it was; yes.

Mr. MOSES. Then, I ask the Senator, Mr. President, if I am justified in assuming that this is one of the instances of which the President spoke to us the other day when he said that the 14 points, now of an historic and evanescent fame, have been made also to conform to the facts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, the Senator can draw his own conclusions. I have done what I wanted to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am surprised that my very innocent resolution of inquiry should have brought on such an animated debate; but now that the Senator from Nebraska has finished resenting, I will correct my remarks. I said a gift to Japan; it was a price paid, and all the world knows it.

I shall discuss the question of Shantung with some fullness at a later time; but now let me say that there is no statute of limitations which runs against a great wrong like that. Poland was partitioned 150 years ago, and that great wrong is being undone now. The fact that we recognize Germany's seizure of Shantung does not make it any better. Germany had two missionaries killed there. She sent out a fleet, with Prince Henry of Prussia on board, and for those two missionaries she took Kiaochow and Tsingtau, which are the great ports and harbors of Shantung; she took a circle about it, the environs, and she took great rights extending throughout the province in connection with railroad, mining, and other concessions. Japan took all that away from Germany during the war. England and France took Belgium away from Germany during the war; but does that give them a claim to Belgium? Japan took Shantung, and she also took the precaution to make an agreement with England that England would sustain her in holding the control of the Shantung Peninsula in taking over the German lease of 99 years. England stated that she would be very glad to do it, it being understood that Japan would support her in taking the islands south of the Equator. Japan made a similar arrangement with France. Shantung—and I use that word for brevity, it includes all the German lease rights which have been handed over to the control of Japan and Kiaochow and Tsingtau and the environs absolutely—is not enemy territory. It is not like Fiume, for Fiume was enemy territory, while Shantung was the territory of a friend and ally.

China came into the war, took the German ships, and sent 200,000 men—she was an unarmed and pacific nation—to labor and work in the trenches and on the railroads behind the line. Many of them were killed; most of them came from the very Province of Shantung. That province was handed over to Japan against the protest of some of our delegates and against the protest of the experts who had charge of that particular question. It was handed over because Japan's signature was needed for the league; it was done as a necessity; and that is the only defense I have heretofore ever heard for it. The territory of an ally, of a friend, who had been loyal to us, was handed over to the great military power of the East. Japan is building up a vast power in China and we are helping her do it.

England stood by and saw Germany take away from Denmark Schleswig-Holstein; she stood by and saw Germany destroy Austria and make it practically a vassal State; she stood by and saw Germany wreck France in 1870; she gave Germany the island of Heligoland; and she has been paying the bill for those awful mistakes in the last four terrible years. She has done it nobly, splendidly, but at a terrific cost. Beware of building up an Asiatic Russia as German Prussia was built up.

There is another great power being built up on the other side of the ocean, and we who are not a party to any secret treaty, an independent Nation with no personal ends to serve, are asked to put our approval at the bottom of that treaty which provides for the robbing of China, handing over this great province to the control practically of Japan. I put aside the question of in-

terest, although it is a very great one, indeed, but I for one do not wish to see my country's name at the bottom of such an agreement as that. I hope it will not be placed there, but at least I know we shall have the opportunity, those of us who do not want our names to go on that record, to vote against giving to Japan this additional vast hold on the continent of Asia at the expense of an unarmed Republic, of a friendly people who were our allies in the war. I think it concerns us nearly to know what Japan has been doing, and that is the reason I reported the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is because of the tensivity of the moment resulting from a somewhat impassioned debate that I have determined to call the attention of the Senate to a recent discussion of the Shantung incident by an author of established reputation in the last number of the *World's Work*. In doing this I am neither approving nor disapproving his narrative, but, inasmuch as we are a friendly Nation, enjoying at the present time relations of the most amicable character with Japan, I think it is due to her, to this country, and to the Senate that something be submitted on the other side, and I submit this as perhaps a better statement than any that I could make and perhaps any that any Member of the Senate could make without considerable preparation.

This article is entitled, "Japan, the Peace, and the Destiny of Asia," and is from the pen of Richard Washburn Child, one of the most reliable and best known of the modern magazine and newspaper contributors. Mr. Child gives a preliminary account, historical in character, of the circumstances under which Germany acquired Kiaochow. With the morality of Germany's action in that regard I have no words but those of condemnation, but it is a fact that she did acquire control of that section of China and that she held it and fortified it and was in possession of it when the World War broke out in August, 1914.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Whatever the character of the possession, in whom did the true sovereignty of the Shantung Peninsula rest?

Mr. THOMAS. With regard to that, my recollection is that the concession from China to Germany consisted of a 99-year lease of Kiaochow, with certain rights of a commercial character, involving railroad building in the Province of Shantung.

Mr. FALL. And with rights of an administrative character in connection with all those enterprises?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and with rights of an administrative character in connection therewith. Japan entered the war against Germany on the 23d day of August, 1914, after having notified Germany, in the precise language which Germany employed against Japan a few years before at the close of her war with China, to evacuate all of her possessions in China. It took the Japanese two months and two weeks thereafter to occupy Tsingtau, and the capture was made, according to this author, on the forenoon of November 7. On November 11, just four years to a day prior to the end of the war, the conqueror formally entered Tsingtau.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that Japan announced her intention then of recapturing these concessions in China that she might restore them to China, the original and only legitimate owner. I now take up the narrative of Mr. Child.

Half a year after the Japanese occupation of Tsingtau a note was exchanged between Japan and China providing for the return of the "leased" territory to China after the war on certain conditions. The four conditions specified in this note of May 25, 1915, are as follows:

1. Opening of the whole Kiaochow as a commercial port.
2. Establishment of a Japanese settlement in the locality to be designated by the Japanese Government.
3. Establishment, if desired by the powers, of an international settlement.
4. Arrangements to be made before the return of the said territory is effected between the Japanese and Chinese Governments with respect to the other conditions and procedures.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. The last proviso, of course, would require time for its execution, though whether it would be necessary to occupy as much time as has elapsed between the 24th day of May, 1915, and the meeting of the world's congress I can not say. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator about the fourth proposition. That contains the meat and pretty near all the meat in the coconut, as I look at it, and provides that the arrangement must be brought about by an agreement between China and Japan. I wish to ask the Senator if, knowing the history of Japan in such matters and the weakness of China, does he think that settlement will be anything more or less than what Japan wants? Is it not about the same as though China had turned it over at once to Japan?

Mr. THOMAS. I must reiterate that my purpose in reading this account into the RECORD just now is that it may go to the public with the comments that have been made upon the action of the congress in Paris regarding Shantung, and not because I am prepared to indorse the completeness of this statement as a justification for that action.

Answering the Senator's question directly, I may say, of course, that when two countries or two men arrange and negotiate upon subjects between them, and there is a great disparity of strength and power between the contracting parties, the conditions are very apt to be as the Senator suggests.

But this author proceeds:

That Japan intends to live up to this promise is proved by the address before Parliament on January 21, 1919, of Viscount Uchida, Japanese minister of foreign affairs. He then said that Kiaochow, on acquisition of the right of free disposal from Germany, would be returned to China "in accordance with the terms of the notes complementary to the treaty of May 25, 1915, regarding the Shantung Province."

The so-called secret treaties of 1917 have no negative effect on the foregoing note or any of its conditions. Baron S. Goto, former minister of foreign affairs in Japan, speaking in New York on May 6, 1919, said: "The so-called secret treaties entered into in 1917 between Japan and her allies, recognizing her right to inherit German rights in Shantung, were nothing but a step toward the fulfillment of that pledge which she had given China in the agreement of 1915. In the judgment of the Japanese Government, it was necessary for Japan to establish an undisputed right over the German territory before she was in a position to restore it to China. Now that the peace conference has granted Japan's wish, the Government of Tokyo will take steps without delay toward the restoration of Kiaochow to China. Not only will Japan restore Kiaochow to China, but she will undoubtedly enter into hearty cooperation with the Government and people of China for the development of Shantung Province."

On April 30, 1919, the Associated Press filed the following dispatch in Paris:

"The agreement regarding the Shantung Peninsula and Kiaochow which has been reached between the council of three and the Japanese delegates provides for their transfer without reserve to Japan, which voluntarily engages to hand the Shantung Peninsula back to China."

"Japan, as an economic concessionaire, gets only such rights under the agreement as are possessed by one or two others of the great powers. The whole future relation between Japan and China, as well as the territorial integrity and political independence of China, is to come at once under the guarantee of the league of nations."

Baron Makino, one of the Japanese peace delegates, gave an interview to the *Matin* on April 30, in which he said: "We are accused of intending to occupy Kiaochow permanently. This is inexact. We have agreed to restore it to China. Our agreements will hold—our agreements always hold. There is no example in history of Japan breaking her word. It is just because nobody has the right to doubt our honor that we ourselves should be allowed to arrange restitution and not be compelled in a way that would indicate unjust suspicion."

Sufficient statements of Japanese statesmen have been cited to show that Kiaochow will be returned to China according to the conditions expressed in the note of May 25, 1915.

To Japan will go a Japanese settlement in Tsingtau, but the other powers, if they desire, will have an international settlement. Japan, the United States, and other powers will benefit equally from the opening of all Kiaochow as a commercial port. China will benefit.

Negotiations will be conducted between Japan and China to settle the question of the future ownership and control of the Tsingtau-Tsinanfu Railway and the collieries developed by the Germans.

The remainder of this article is devoted to a discussion of the Chinese complaint.

Mr. President, I put that into the RECORD for what it is worth, and for no more. When an appropriate time comes, I may have something to say with regard to my own view of that feature of the treaty. At present I reserve judgment, merely with the remark that in our discussion of these matters I do not think it is always fair to assume that our Allies—and they are still our Allies—are actuated by any more dishonest or dishonorable motives than lie behind our own actions at the peace conference.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. FALL. I simply desire to ask if included in the article is the official protest of the Chinese delegation made at the peace council?

Mr. THOMAS. No. There is a discussion of the Chinese position; but the protest to which the Senator refers, and which is published in the magazine issued by the *New York Times*, is not in the article, and it might be extremely appropriate to introduce it into the RECORD in connection with this statement.

Mr. FALL. I was going to ask the Senator, as he has read part of it, if he would include that.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be very glad to do it, or I am perfectly willing that the Senator shall introduce it now. I yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Chinese people themselves are entitled to be heard upon their understanding of and—if they have any—their objections to the action of the peace conference in this matter.

The Chinese delegation in Paris issued a statement on May 2 expressing dissatisfaction with the decision. The statement in full reads:

The Chinese delegation has been informed orally on behalf of the council of three of the outline of the settlement proposed regarding the Shantung question. Under this settlement all rights to Kiaochow formerly belonging to Germany are transferred to Japan. While Japan voluntarily engages to hand back the Shantung Peninsula in full sovereignty to China, she is allowed to retain the economic privileges formerly enjoyed by Germany.

These privileges, the delegation is informed, refer to the Tsingtau-Chinan Railway, 280 miles long, the mines connected with it, and the two railways to be built connecting Shantung with the two trunk lines from Peking to the Yangtse Valley. In addition she obtains the right to establish a settlement at Tsingtau, and, although the Japanese military forces, it is understood, will be withdrawn from Shantung at the earliest possible moment, the employment of special railway police is permitted.

Such being the outline of the proposed settlement, the Chinese delegation can not but view it with disappointment and dissatisfaction.

These German rights in Shantung originated in an act of wanton aggression in 1897, characteristic of Prussian militarism. To transfer these rights to Japan, as the council of three proposes to do, is, therefore, to confirm an act of aggression which has been resented by the Chinese people ever since its perpetration.

Such a virtual substitution of Japan for Germany in Shantung is serious enough in itself, but it becomes grave when the position of Japan in southern Manchuria and eastern Mongolia is read in connection with it. Firmly entrenched on both sides of the Gulf of Pechili, the water outlet of Peking, with a hold on the three trunk lines from Peking and connecting it with the rest of China, the capital becomes but an enclave in the midst of Japanese influence.

Moreover, owing to China's declaration of war against the Central Powers on August 14, 1917, and the abrogation of all treaties and agreements between China and these powers, the German rights automatically reverted to China.

The significant part of this protest, Mr. President, was the last paragraph read, with reference to the position of Japan in China if she is allowed to retain the railroads and the Japanese concessioners in the Shantung Peninsula—that the capital of China itself is absolutely in the hands of Japan, surrounded entirely by Japanese influence.

Mr. President, it was this transaction to which the President of the United States, in addressing himself to the Senate a few days since, had reference. The President himself is too shrewd a man and has too much regard for his own standing in the eyes of the people of the United States to undertake to make such a defense as has been attempted to be made for him upon this floor. The President of the United States may not be all that some of his worshippers think he is, and in some respects I am frank to say that I think he is as much overrated as any man who ever lived in the United States, but I can say without hesitation or mental reservation that when it comes to a proposition where he may be held to account he is as shrewd as any man who ever addressed a public audience in leaving himself a position from which he can gracefully retire, and then he is equally shrewd in delegating to others, who either have not his ability or have not his regard for the position in which they may place themselves, the ordinary work—I will not use the other expression which I might use—in undertaking to make a defense of such an absolutely indefensible proposition as is presented before the Senate of the United States, and one which the President of the United States, standing before us, would not defend.

I want to read what the President said:

It was our duty to do everything that it was within our power to do to make the triumph of freedom and of right a lasting triumph in the assurance of which men might everywhere live without fear.

Old entanglements of every kind stood in the way—promises which governments had made to one another in the days when might and right were confused and the power of the victor was without restraint.

Note what the Chinese say with reference to Prussian militarism seizing or raping the Shantung Peninsula in 1907:

Engagements which contemplated any dispositions of territory, any extensions of sovereignty that might seem to be to the interest of those who had the power to insist upon them, had been entered into without thought of what the people concerned might wish or profit by.

And I invite the attention of Senators who will read it, who care to inform themselves upon this proposition, to read the notes, respectively, of Great Britain and France in answer to the Japanese propositions upon the Shantung question, where Great Britain immediately said, "We will agree with you that you may have such rights as Germany had," and where France even went further, and then, on the other hand, asked Japan to yield a certain few things to Great Britain and France, respectively.

And these could not always be honorably brushed aside—

Continues the President, excusing himself.

It was not easy to graft the new order of ideas on the old, and some of the fruits of the grafting may, I fear, for a time be bitter.

In the eyes of the President, in the conception of the President of the United States, the rape of Shantung was a bitter fruit, and he was compelled to engraft upon the new ideas this bitter fruit of the old ideas; and yet to the minds of some of his worshippers it is not bitter fruit, but a sweeter could not be rolled in the mouth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has read as much as he did of the President's address to the Senate. The President attended the conference, the American delegates attended it, as the representatives of our one Nation. They did not go there with the power of making every provision of the treaty of peace to suit themselves. Like every other instrument making a contract between various nations, it was necessarily an instrument of compromise here and there. As the President, in addition to what the Senator from New Mexico said, added, in addressing the Senate, that not every provision of the treaty met with his satisfaction, and he supposed there were no representatives of any nation on the earth that entirely approved every provision of the treaty. Five great nations and nearly a score of other smaller nations meet for the purpose of bringing about peace and terminating a war, and Senators in this body talk as if they would have had them split to pieces at the conference table and go to war with one another—the very worst thing that could have happened for the world; the very thing that Germany hoped for, and that the wisdom of France and Great Britain and the United States and Italy prevented. It was hoped that little things like Fiume, the Shantung Peninsula, and some other things, perhaps adding to the power of Belgium up in the neighborhood of Holland, might create dissensions that might lead to an adjournment of the conferees, and thereby to a delay of peace, and therefore possibly to a separate treaty with Germany by this, that, or the other of her enemies.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] insinuates that the theory of a separate treaty on Japan's part had already begun. I do not know. I do not believe it, because I believe in Japan's good faith; but all the time Germany was hoping for a separate treaty with Italy, and then, Russia being in anarchy on the east, Poland not yet upon her feet, Esthonia and Lithuania and all the Baltic Provinces and Finland as well being up in arms, not only against the balance of Russia but against one another, it was evident if Germany could have gotten a breathing spell and come back with Italy or somebody else in the west or Japan and Bolshevik Russia in the east in alliance with her to a fresh beginning of hostilities, the very worst thing that could have happened to the world would have followed. There is no use in saying that the German Army was whipped when this war terminated. I have seen that Americans claim that they whipped it, the British claim that they whipped it, the French claim that they whipped it, but it never was routed to the very last day. Germany herself had lost her morale; the army had to some extent lost its morale as a reflection from home; but that magnificent military machine was there, and is there yet, and do not let yourselves forget it. On an order of 48 or 72 hours, if they had a promising arena upon which to play, they could be remobilized and put almost anywhere upon the borders of Germany.

In his short, impassioned speech the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made a mistake about a vital fact. Shantung was not the territory of a friendly power at the beginning of this war. Shantung *was* the occupied, possessed, and fully governed territory of an enemy power at the beginning of this war; and there is no denial of a historical fact, no matter by whom made nor how important his opinion may be. Shantung had gone to Germany by her own fraud and force and by the acquiescence or the quiescence of the world. A shameful act, yes—in pay of the lives of two missionaries to seize 36,000,000 people, or certain concessions amongst them, together with entire control of ports and harbors. Shameful, yes; part of the old order of things in which there is so much more of shame than there is of credit to the nations of the earth. But Shantung was German territory when this war opened—German possessed, German occupied, German ruled and governed—everybody else verboten—garrisoned by German troops, held by the German Empire under a treaty with China—a treaty made by force, yes. So was our treaty with Mexico made by force. So was the treaty with France at the end of the Napoleonic wars made by force. So is this treaty with Germany now made by force. Are Senators going to deny the binding authority of treaties when made by force?

Now, whatever the right or wrong of it may be—and the wrong of it stood out so that a man with moral perception enough to fill a nutmeg could see it—the treaty had been made and acquiesced in, not only by everybody else but by us.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is right about one thing. He speaks of Great Britain bringing endless punishment and expense upon herself by acquiescing in various things

that took place on the Continent of Europe. We acquiesced in them, too. If she was stupid, so were we. There is no denying that both of us were. The only difference is that the penalty of the stupidity struck her more quickly and more directly in the face. We made no protest about robbing Denmark of Schleswig-Holstein. We made no protest even about invading Belgium, contrary to all treaties. We made no protest about cutting Alsace-Lorraine from the very side and flank of France. If you are going to go back to all the wrongs in history and talk about Great Britain and ourselves "acquiescing" in them, both seeking peace, your conversation will be endless. But the fact remains, and it is a historical fact, first, that China had by treaty given certain territory and certain concessions in Shantung to Germany; secondly, that Japan had whipped the German forces in Shantung and had taken Kiaochow and the other places thus ceded, and had asserted her military power over the territory—German territory at the time—and, third, that China entered into a treaty with Japan in 1915, which has been read, together with the qualifications and modifications of it, by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], which acknowledged the status, and ceded Germany's ill-got gains to Japan.

Those are the historical facts; but I am the last man here present to urge them as the sole or sufficient reason for this provision in this treaty. The real reason for this provision in this treaty was that Japan was going to walk out and quit, and make no treaty, and probably make a separate treaty with Germany, unless that point was yielded. Japan had already applied to have racial equality recognized under the treaty, and she had failed. Then she came up, buttressed—buttressed, mark you—first by a treaty with China; secondly, by a treaty with Great Britain; third, by a treaty with France; fourth, by an understanding with Great Britain, France, and Italy, and Italy felt compelled to stand by her—they had given their word. Now, how could President Wilson be expected to overcome these four great principal allied powers, when all that was in the treaty was that Japan got the rights which Germany had held, with modifications to surrender those rights upon the fulfillment of the four conditions under the Chino-Japanese treaty of 1915, which the Senator from Colorado read?

Now I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator says that the territory in Shantung did not belong to China at the time the war began.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It did not for the time of the lease, 99 years.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, Germany had certain lease rights there, but the sovereignty of Shantung was in China, and China was exercising it. That, however, was not the question which I rose to address to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Right there the Senator is wrong. The absolute sovereignty during the lease of Kiaochow Harbor was in Germany, and the right and power to control which constitutes practical sovereignty rested in Germany.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is mistaken. Germany had certain economic rights there, but the political sovereignty was in China. But that is not the question which I rose to submit to the Senator. Did Germany have any rights of any nature or kind whatever in China when the Versailles conference met?

Mr. WILLIAMS. She did not, because they had passed, first, by conquest, and, secondly, by the Chinese-Japanese treaty, to Japan.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; precisely. They had passed to Japan under the solemn promise of Japan to the United States that she would return them to China.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and that is a part of the treaty of 1915 which Japan made with China. The Senator has no right to say Japan will not keep her word.

Now, Mr. President, to proceed, I want to say that there is always the presumption of good faith when two nations enter into a treaty with one another. That the presumption is frequently disappointed goes without saying, but for you to take for granted in this august body that Japan is not going to carry out in good faith the terms of her treaty with China and her treaty with the allied powers, of which her treaty with China is a part, is insulting to a friendly nation and a late associate in war.

I want to say another thing. Unlike some Christian nations, Japan has hitherto kept her word. I believe she is going to keep it now.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to add that if Japan does not keep her word, then the league of nations has a right to hear the Chinese cause over again under that clause of the covenant of the league of nations which leaves questions of interpretation of treaties to the determination of the league. When these conditions are fulfilled, if Japan does not comply with the

treaty, then the question of the proper interpretation and fulfillment of the treaty will come before the league of peace, and that league will have a right, if it thinks it a correct conclusion after hearing the evidence on both sides, to say that in order to comply with a proper construction of the treaty Japan must vacate Shantung.

I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator says, "if Japan kept her promise." I assert here that Japan has never kept a treaty engagement with reference to China or Korea that she has ever made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Japan has done this in the case of China, and I regret it, of course, as do other people: She has forced upon China virtually certain treaties, but as far as I know she has kept them. As to a treaty with Korea, she finally took Korea as an act of war, and she occupies it under the compulsion of no treaty.

I do not approve of the Shantung proviso in the treaty, and I will venture to say that the President of the United States did not. I have never heard him say. I will venture to say that none of our commissioners did, but I will further venture to say that if you had been a member of the commission, and you, and you, and you, and I, and we had come up against this claim of Japan, buttressed by these three treaties and one understanding—first with China and then with Great Britain, and then with France, and then with Italy—we would have regarded it as a rock wall too high to climb and too thick to butt through, and unless we had wanted to leave the peace conference ourselves and make a separate treaty with Germany—in itself an act of bad faith—there was nothing to do but to surrender the point. We could not have everything our own way.

A friend wrote me the other day about this question. I told him he reminded me a little of one of my daughters once. She had straight hair, and another of the little girls had curly hair. The little straight-haired one was a little envious of the curly-haired one. One day the curly-haired girl was complaining of some hardship of some sort, fancied, of course, and the other one turned to her and said, "Well, you can't have everything and curly hair." [Laughter.] We could not expect to go to Paris and get everything. Great Britain is a sovereign power, and had a right to make a treaty with Japan. France is a sovereign power, and had a right to make a treaty with Japan.

Even in our discussion of the question of Fiume we have based ourselves upon the fact that the treaty of London between Italy and Great Britain especially reserved Fiume from Italian sovereignty. The league of nations goes as far as it can in that direction. It says all treaties entered into antagonistic to the provisions of the league are canceled and set aside. That is virtually what it means; I am not quoting the language. That is as far as it could go.

Now, Mr. President, let us take up the conditions facing us at Paris and see just where we were. A great war had just taken place. Some twelve millions of human beings had been killed or were stricken with death. A score of millions had been crippled. Billions of money had been poured out like water. The world and its industries were mortgaged for two generations to come, or, if not two, at least one. The thing that the world was yearning for was peace. It was not nearly so anxious for exactly the right sort of peace in every provision and every article as it was for peace itself. The British soldiers were begging to be demobilized and carried home. The American soldiers were almost in mutiny; so anxiously were they begging to be carried back to the United States at once. All this was under the theory that the German Army was "whipped," which it never was. It was defeated, but it never was routed up to the very end. All of it alive was there. Were we going to meet at Paris and quarrel with one another? The great danger was that that might take place in this case which took place in the Balkans when the Balkan league, after whipping Turkey, went to war among its own members. The danger was after victory had been won that we should quarrel and fight with one another and inaugurate a new war more destructive than the old one. The President did the best he could; our commissioners did the best they could; and to set aside a great instrument or to endanger it, or to endanger its successful working out in a peaceful way without renewed war, just because you do not like one provision here and another provision there, strikes me as being foolish—to use ultracharitable language.

Suppose we struck out the Shantung provision here? Suppose Japan then said, "All right, strike us, too, and the things up." What are we going to do? What could we do? Put all the Navy in the Pacific Ocean, put all our soldiers on our ships again and go to China and take Shantung away from Japan? She is not going to give it up except by war. Do we want our boys sent to Asia to whip Japan out of Shantung, when there are 400,000,000 of Chinamen who ought to do their own fighting in their own cause?

Why are Senators so loud-voiced about turning over Germany's stealage from China to Japan, when they raised not a voice about the original German stealage? Is it because they thought Germany would take in her heyday of power "no back talk"? Japan served notice at Paris that she would retire from the conference after she had been defeated upon the other propositions if she were defeated on this. Then she and all of us effected an agreement, and the agreement is sacred, whether we feel like it or not, whether I like it or not. I do not like it. There are other provisions in the treaty that I do not like.

I want to say in conclusion that Japan is doing one of the most dangerous things in the world for herself and the world, unless she keeps faith and fulfills the articles of this treaty or, rather, performs the requirement of the treaty of 1915 with China. She is running the risk of treading upon 400,000,000 people with her little 36,000,000 until, like the worm, they rise, until she arouses the sleeping giant or the sleeping dog, as she probably would prefer to phrase it. She is treading the path of danger in doing that. She is giving those 400,000,000 transportation facilities, she is undertaking to train Chinese soldiers, and the Mongolian can invade Europe again, as he did under Genghis Khan, if he so wills. Japan is doing a dangerous thing. The whole world had better let China alone and not teach her warfare. The way to teach her war is to keep oppressing her and making her angry with "foreign devils" of every description, until she has soldiers trained by German or other officers. There is an abundance of officers without jobs now. Then, about 40 or 50 years from now, Japan may find out that instead of her conquering China she has taught China to organize and wield the power to throw Japan into the Pacific Ocean.

I believe Japan is going to keep faith. If I had any suspicion to the contrary, I would not utter it now. If I had an agreement with the Senator from North Carolina, or if there were an agreement between him and the Senator from Colorado, a sacred agreement, and I even suspected that one or the other might not keep it, I would keep my mouth shut until I found out whether he was going to do it or not, unless I wanted to be insulting. The Senate does not want to insult friendly powers.

We are getting to do that too much. We pass all sorts of resolutions of every description here, whenever we feel like it, just as if we were a debating club and our official resolutions did not amount to anything except our individual views. This sort of speeches and these resolutions on the floor of the Senate are, in a way, official, and go to these other countries as official utterances, and wound and hurt and make enemies unnecessarily.

Mr. President, I never saw a Democratic platform with every plank of which I agreed. I never expect to see one unless you just let me draw it up [laughter]; and if you let me draw it up in toto it might be that in three or four days I would find I was mistaken about one or the other of the planks in it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that perhaps the attitude of many of the opponents of the league is due to the fact that they did not draw it up themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, there is no doubt about that. A great deal of feeling is due to that, at least.

Mr. BORAH. That can not apply to some of us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the Senator from Arizona said some only. He did not mean everybody nor did he name anyone particularly. But there was a great deal of complaint in the newspapers that "Senators were not sent over," a few of them, to help draw up the entire thing, the idea being that if they could have drawn it up, it would be better, I suppose. I venture to say there are not three men on the other side of the Chamber who would have agreed on the terms of a covenant of the league of nations. I know several who would not have agreed to any sort of a league of nations, and, by the way, I have respect for the honesty and sincerity of their opinions. I can understand that. I can understand a man not wanting any sort of an alliance of any description or any sort of a covenant of peace or anything else on the theory that it might "entangle" us; but I confess I can not understand the man who says he does want a league of peace and then quarrels with every little provision in this one—almost every "t" and "i."

First, it was said the Monroe doctrine was not safe, and then Wilson told us he thought it extended the Monroe doctrine to the world, but he thought maybe he could get it recognized by name. Then he went over there and had it excluded eo nomine, and because it was called a "regional understanding, like the Monroe doctrine," naming "the Monroe doctrine" in so many words, these critics who did not write it deny that the provision of exclusion applies to the Monroe doctrine at all, because they say it is not properly defined as a regional understanding. It is named, and that is better, is it not? Suppose I excepted from my remarks "all black-haired men, like the Senator from Idaho."

Would the fact that his hair has a tinge of auburn keep him from being accepted as the party meant and named?

By the way, it is a regional understanding. The region happens to be the region constituting the United States and all South and Central America and the West Indian Islands, but it is "regional" all the same. It is also described as "calculated to keep the peace." It not only was "calculated to keep the peace," but it has kept it in America, as far as Europe is concerned, for 100 years now, except once when France invaded Mexico, or it will be 100 years in 1923.

Even that did not satisfy these super-hyper-critics. They then said, "Oh, well, you must give us a chance to withdraw from this thing." The President said every sovereign power had the right to withdraw upon proper notice from any sort of a treaty, of course. But he went over and got the withdrawal written in, coupled necessarily with the idea that the withdrawing nation must "fulfill any obligations" already entered into, whatever they were. Then they quarrel about that just as much as they did before.

Then the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] said it surrenders us to "the niggers," and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] says it surrenders us to the Pope! Then there was expressed the idea that we would be forced by it to help Great Britain conquer Ireland if Ireland should ever revolt, and when we point to that part of the treaty which shows to the contrary, because it refers only to external aggression and not to any internal troubles of any description, an Irish friend of mine says, "Yes; that may be so, but while you can not interfere on England's part you can not interfere on Ireland's part either." In other words, we are wanted to help fight to redress Ireland's wrongs—to "pull her chestnuts out of the fire"—at the expense of our treasure and blood. So they make the ground of objection that the league makes us help England conquer Ireland, and then they go to the second ground and say they object because under the league we can not help Ireland conquer England. I do not know that we want to do either. I have no boys to spare for their mutually disgraceful squabble.

Mr. President, I confess I am prejudiced, because it did not take this war to awake my conscience and my mind to the necessity of some covenant of peace amongst the nations, some instrumentality of some sort whereby arbitration could enter into play instead of cannon. For 20 years before this war began I have been in favor of a league of nations to keep the peace of the world if it could be constructed. Unfortunately, it took 12,000,000 lives and 20,000,000 limbs, and I do not know how many billions of dollars to make a whole lot of other people see it. Unfortunately, now, even all of them can not see it unless each can draw up the league for himself. Each fellow is in favor of a league except the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], who are just as honestly opposed to all of it; but pretty nearly all the balance are in favor of a league, if you will let them draw it all up.

Five of the principal nations of the world at war, and a score more nominally in the war, after long travail, agree, and then a United States Senator or two, that none of them ever heard of, representing in ninety-sixth part one branch of one of the nations, wants to draw up a league to suit himself, and says, "Unless you have it virtually just to suit me I will not vote for it." One Senator said he had no objection except to this one provision about Shantung, and that was so awfully wrong in his opinion that he would not vote for it. I have forgotten what strong expression it was that he used, but unless something took place which never could happen he would not vote for it.

I repeat, "You can not have everything and curly hair."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we are indebted to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for stating frankly and quite clearly why Shantung was given over to Japan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator, of course, understands I just state that as my inference. I have no intimate knowledge.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I understand the Senator was speaking for himself, but at the same time I know the close relationship of the Senator to other people.

The Senator from Mississippi has stated frankly the real reason for giving Shantung to Japan. It may just as well be accepted as the reason without any circumlocution or uncertainty of argument or bad logic. It is because Japan refused to become a party to the treaty—either the treaty or the league—unless she had Shantung. After you have searched all the evidence and traveled over the entire field of facts and searched all the records of the peace conference, Senator WILLIAMS will be found to be correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, if the Senator will pardon me, Great Britain and France supported her in it, because they had made treaties with her.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; Great Britain and France also have a part of China. Anyone who has studied the situation in the Far East

knows that the delivery of Shantung to Japan is a very small item in the tremendous program which has been outlined for the dismemberment of the Chinese Republic. It is quite correct, therefore, to say that Japan demanded Shantung, and that she refused to sign the treaty or to be a member of the league of nations unless she received it, and it is quite correct to say also that Great Britain and France supported Japan in the demand. *It is equally correct to say that the President of the United States could do nothing else than give Shantung to Japan if he desired to have the treaty of peace signed and the league of nations accepted. I agree with both those propositions.*

I do not criticize the President if he conceived the signing of the treaty was of more importance to the future happiness and tranquillity of the people of the world than the distribution of the Chinese Empire among these several powers. I do not criticize him for taking that course. It was a matter of judgment. But let us not here undertake to camouflage the facts. The Senator from Mississippi has stated them just as they are, and the question with reference to Shantung is whether or not the United States will become a party to the transaction. Either Caesar or nothing.

Mr. President, every Government which sat at that council table when Shantung was bartered to Japan was under a solemn treaty or agreement to respect the territorial integrity of China. The United States had had a treaty or agreement for years with China to respect her territorial integrity. France had a treaty with China to protect her territorial integrity, which was in force and in operation at the time that she sat at the peace conference. Great Britain had a treaty to protect the territorial integrity of China, and every nation which helped to distribute Shantung to Japan and initiate the dismemberment of the Chinese Republic had a solemn agreement or treaty with China to respect or protect her territorial integrity. These treaties or agreements were ignored. Honor and common honesty were ignored, because Japan threatened, and Great Britain and France for selfish reasons supported Japan. It is too true that this treaty could not go through until China was virtually divided. It is perhaps true the President had to consent. But I object to calling it a new charter of civilization. It is the old imperialistic system in its most revolting aspect.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator give the date of the treaty to which he refers?

Mr. BORAH. I can not do it now. I thought I had it here, but I have not. I will put it in the RECORD later or a reference to it, so it may be easily identified.

Mr. THOMAS. Was it prior to the acquisition by Germany of the Shantung territory?

Mr. BORAH. I could not state as to the date. But take the Root-Takahira agreement—I have forgotten the date of it, but the Senator will recall the first paragraph of it was that the United States and Japan would respect the territorial integrity of China.

Mr. THOMAS. That being the case, did not that duty shift to the United States when Germany seized Shantung?

Mr. BORAH. I think that is probably true.

Mr. THOMAS. We acquiesced in it at that time and also failed to do our duty, and in that the Senator is correct.

Mr. BORAH. I am not forgiving that feature of it at all; two wrongs do not make a right. We are here disposing of the proposition as it was taken up and settled at Versailles.

Mr. THOMAS. The thought I had in mind, if the Senator will permit me, is that if we and the other nations having this treaty had acquiesced in the seizure, because that is what it was, of Kiaochow and Shantung at the time the conference met in Paris we by our action recognized German sovereignty in that particular section of China; and that being the case, it could not be considered because of our own acquiescence in a wrong as to Chinese territory at that time.

Mr. BORAH. At the time the Versailles conference convened Germany had no territorial rights whatever in China.

Mr. THOMAS. Because Japan had taken it from her by force of arms.

Mr. BORAH. First in importance, because when China declared war on Germany all Germany's rights were at an end. And while Japan had taken Germany's rights by force of arms, in the ultimatum which Japan issued to Germany she included and incorporated in the ultimatum a promise to restore them to China.

Mr. THOMAS. That is entirely true, and that was followed by the treaty of May, 1915, prescribing the terms under which the transfer was made.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; it was followed by the treaty of 1915; and everyone knows that the treaty of 1915 was secured

by force and under the protest not only of China but virtually under the protest of the United States—

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. BORAH. The United States asked Japan officially if it was her intention to retain the Chinese territory, and Japan asserted that it was not.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true; but the fact that the treaty was extorted by force does not do away with the legality of the treaty. If so, then half the treaties of the world are scraps of paper.

Mr. BORAH. Then why did we restore Alsace and Lorraine to France? The Senator also leaves out one important item in that proposition. The first treaty with Germany was extorted by force. It was founded in immorality and injustice. Japan succeeded by force to the rights of Germany. China declared war upon Germany. That terminated the treaty between China and Germany. Japan had no other right than the right of possession of the property of a friendly power or an ally.

Mr. THOMAS. But she had acquired it by force of arms before China declared war against Germany?

Mr. BORAH. Precisely so; but she could not acquire anything except what Germany had, and what Germany had ended when China declared war against her.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That principle does not apply when possession of territory changes.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes, it does. There is no difference whatever in the two propositions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BORAH. In international law the very moment that Germany's rights ended by reason of the declaration of war, that moment no one could acquire anything by virtue of having taken possession of Germany's rights.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No one could acquire anything in virtue of the German treaty after that took place, but they might acquire something in virtue of war intervening between the time when the treaty was valid and the time when Germany entered into war.

Mr. BORAH. Let us see about that. Germany acquires her rights in the first instance by force and by fraud. China signs the German treaty under duress. There comes a time when we want to eliminate Germany from China. Japan, the United States, Great Britain, and France are all interested in eliminating Germany from China, and China is an ally, also, and we go in and take possession of the property of a friendly power. Later that friendly power terminates the rights of Germany by entering the war against her. What possible right, either in international or municipal law, or in morals or justice, could Japan possibly acquire by having taken possession from Germany of that which Germany acquired by force and that which China afterwards terminated by entering the war against Germany?

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi had better stand by his original proposition, and that is that there was no right upon which to found the demand of Japan. It was simply the fact that Japan required this as a prerequisite to her entering the league.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not in the league, but in signing the treaty of peace.

Mr. BORAH. Yes, or anything else in the league.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not in the league, but in signing the treaty of peace.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. Under the argument of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] if Japan fell heir to the German rights by virtue of her conquest of Shantung, conquest by arms, why did Japan approach Great Britain on February 16, 1917—

Mr. WILLIAMS. "To make assurance doubly sure."

Mr. FALL. The Senator's mind works as quickly as usual. And the French ambassador on February 19, and ask them to enter into a secret agreement, a suppressed agreement only recently exposed, and to agree that Japan might at the peace table receive their support in the retention of the Shantung Peninsula.

Mr. BORAH. Yes, and—

Mr. THOMAS. I understood that question to be directed to me.

Mr. BORAH. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. And also Japan demanded the signing of this treaty as a prerequisite for her consent to permit China to enter the war at all. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Mississippi has suggested to me that I should answer that she did it because she wanted to make assurance doubly sure, and I think there is much in that. I believe, however, that there is no obstacle or objection to any country attempting to secure that which she has by the

suggestion of treaties with other countries with whom she is at that time in alliance. Japan declared war very largely because she was a party to a treaty of alliance with Great Britain, and under the terms of that treaty, with which I am not at all familiar, it may be that she was required to do so or felt it safe to do so, since otherwise some common claims to the property might be advanced by her ally, Great Britain. That, however, is a conjecture.

If the Senator will permit me to add one other observation, I do not think the fact that Japan did make these overtures or sign the treaty thereafter has anything to do with the main proposition, which is, if two nations by a treaty, whether acquired by force or otherwise, so change their boundaries that one obtains possession of a part of the territory of the other which it loses to a warring power, after which the despoiled country declares war against the despoiler, the declaration of war at that time serves *eo ipso* to restore conditions as they were prior to the original arrangement.

Mr. FALL. We are trespassing upon the time of the Senator from Idaho, but if he will allow me a moment, I think we need not fall into the realms of conjecture to ascertain the purposes or the acts of these nations at this time, because we have the words, the demands, and the reason for the demands given in the exposition of these secret negotiations. If the Senator will allow me, in the approach made to the French ambassador at Tokyo on February 19, Viscount Motono said—

Mr. THOMAS. Was that February 19 of this year?

Mr. FALL. On February 19, 1917, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs said:

The Imperial Japanese Government has not yet formally entered into conversations with the Entente powers concerning the conditions of peace I propose to present to Germany, because it is guided by the thought that such questions ought to be decided in concert between Japan and the said powers at the moment when the peace negotiations begin. Nevertheless, in view of recent developments in the general situation, and in view of the particular arrangements concerning peace conditions, such as arrangements relative to the disposition of the Bosphorus, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles, being already under discussion by the powers interested, the Imperial Japanese Government believes that the moment has come for it also to express its desires relative to certain conditions of peace essential to Japan and to submit them for the consideration of the Government of the French Republic.

The French Government is thoroughly informed of all the efforts the Japanese Government has made in a general manner to accomplish its task in the present war, and particularly to guaranty for the future the peace of Oriental Asia and the security of the Japanese Empire, for which it is absolutely necessary to take from Germany its bases of political, military, and economic activity in the Far East.

Under these conditions the Imperial Japanese Government proposes to demand from Germany at the time of the peace negotiations the surrender of the territorial rights and special interests Germany possessed before the war in Shantung and the islands situated north of the equator in the Pacific Ocean.

The Imperial Japanese Government confidently hopes the Government of the French Republic, realizing the legitimacy of these demands, will give assurance that, her case being proved, Japan may count upon its full support on this question.

And it was in similar language that Japan approached Great Britain. I will not take the time of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to read the replies of both those great Governments to this demand or suggestion, or whatever you choose to call it, of Japan as to what she proposed to demand at the peace table. It is only necessary to say that she received immediate private assurance from Great Britain and from France that her demand would be heeded.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, no man does credit to his intellectual integrity who undertakes to justify Japan's legal right to Shantung. She had no legal right. The able Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] says that possibly some obligation rested upon Japan and Great Britain growing out of the Anglo-Japanese treaty and that because Japan entered the war at the suggestion of Great Britain there was some obligation arising by reason of that fact.

Mr. THOMAS. That is merely conjecture.

Mr. BORAH. But that really is not entitled, with all due respect to the able Senator, to be a matter of conjecture, for the reason that both Great Britain and Japan have officially stated that Japan did not enter the war by reason of the Anglo-Japanese agreement or treaty; and Viscount Ishii, in his Fourth of July speech at Boston, said that there was no obligation under the Anglo-Japanese treaty that Japan should enter the war; that it related alone to matters which were not covered by the situation as it then existed, and that Great Britain did not request that Japan enter the war.

Not only that, Mr. President, but Great Britain was rather desirous at that time that she should be permitted to take possession of the German possessions rather than for Japan to do so, and Japan entered the war wholly for another reason. Japan entered the war for the purpose of obtaining those possessions. The evidence, both circumstantial and direct, is conclusive upon that proposition. She entered the war for that purpose; and when she had secured those possessions her activities in the war

practically ceased. She devoted her entire ability and her transcendent ingenuity to securing ultimate and final possession, when she came to the peace table, of those things which she had taken possession of by virtue of war. So, Mr. President, I repeat that the able Senator from Mississippi has stated the whole thing—that there was no treaty obligation which was binding. There was no obligation other than the fact that Japan held the key to the situation.

No nation has ever played its diplomatic game with greater ingenuity and greater ability and greater foresight than did Japan at Versailles. In the first place, she put out her racial equality demand, which she never expected to receive and did not care anything particularly about; but it was the thing upon which she placed her first demand. Then, when the second situation arose with reference to her possessions in China, she was in a position to say: "We will not submit to being rejected or refused twice upon matters which are of vital concern to us."

It not only means that she is in possession of Shantung, but it means that she now controls the three great gateways to China. She is in control of the Manchurian Railway gateway into China; she is in control of the Shantung gateway; and she holds the Formosa Island, which commands the situation with reference to the other and third great gateway into China.

This means, as every student of eastern affairs frankly says it means, the dismemberment of China. It means not alone the possession for the time of Shantung, the transference of from thirty to forty million of people to the domination of an alien enemy, but it means the rupture and breaking up of the Chinese Republic and the Chinese nation. But it means war before the fearful crime is consummated. And article 10 binds us to take part in the war, for when China undertakes to get back her stolen territory and to get back her bartered peoples it will be an application of external territorial aggression.

The Senator from Mississippi asks, What will we do about it? Shall we refuse to recognize the demand of Japan? If so, says the Senator, shall we transfer our fleet to the Pacific Ocean and stand ready for war? I do not think that any such outlook as that need be entertained. I do not anticipate that because we ourselves refuse to underwrite the rape of Shantung we shall be challenged to war. But, Mr. President, let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that something of that kind stares us in the face, then I beg you to contemplate the position we occupy to-day in this entangling alliance affair, that the United States, for the first time in its history, must underwrite the slavery and the oppression of 40,000,000 of people under threat. We have stood for 150 years with a clean record, but now we are told that we must have war if we do not underwrite and perpetuate the transfer of 38,000,000 of human souls to an alien power. That is the thing that is put up to us by the Senator from Mississippi.

I do not think that Japan would go to war unless we underwrite this. She would likely be perfectly satisfied with her treaty with France and with Great Britain. That is their business; that is their doorstep which they may clean or leave unclean as they prefer. I do not presume that Japan expected us to perpetuate for all time that which we have now agreed to do.

But, Mr. President, if the time has come when the United States must engage in enslaving people and in establishing machinery by which they shall be kept in oppression, if the time has come when the United States must consent to the dismemberment of a great nation and to the breaking up and scattering of 400,000,000 people, if the time has come when we must violate our solemn treaties which we have with China to respect her territorial integrity, or face the challenge of another power, we will face the challenge of another power. Whatever else happens we will not sacrifice our honor. We do not anticipate war with Japan; but one thing the American people will never submit to when the facts are known—they will never remain a party to a treaty which has the effect of oppressing millions upon millions of people. We may not draw out now; but when the facts are revealed from time to time, as the debate and consideration goes on, as it will go on for weeks and months, when the true import of this transaction is known, the American people will refuse to break up and dismember the Chinese nation. I say, therefore, Mr. President, while I do not anticipate and certainly do not want trouble with Japan, we will still have the courage to do the honorable thing.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, published July 7, 1919.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

AUT CÆSAR AUT NULLUS.

If the action of the peace conference in respect to China had been actuated by principle, there would be no more to be said in the matter. Neither the protests of Chinese statesmen nor the invective of atrabilious critics could have had any more effect than the barking of dogs. As it is, the efforts of the great powers to justify their action and to persuade Peking to be "reasonable" are absolutely predestined to failure. To begin with, supposing that the ratifying bodies of all the powers, great or small, agree to whitewash the peace conference by accepting its decision, is there one of them which is foolish enough to imagine that this will affect principle? A greater philosopher by far than any of those who sat round the peace table wrote to certain little churches in Galatia, far more insignificant in the full tide of Roman pride and insolence than the powers of to-day can pretend that China is to them, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Principle, in other words, is irrefragably principle. And though all the powers in the world say that two and two make five, their sum total is, and will remain, exactly four. Nor is it scarcely necessary to say, will this be altered in any way should China itself be induced to become "reasonable," and to admit that the handing over of 36,000,000 of people to an alien power, with no questions asked, is self-determination. Two and two, in short, will remain four even if the fact be misstated thirty-six millions of times. So far no reason has been produced for the great or minor powers casting themselves for the rôle of Blueskin to Japan's Jack Sheppard other than the fact that Jack Sheppard's presence is much desired in the league of nations. If this be the fact, it can only be said that the league of nations must be in a parlous condition. When the bishop, in the story, dined, somewhat perforce and by reason of the cold and a great hunger, with the highwayman, in the inn by the Great North Road, it may be remembered that he tucked up his apron, so that that symbol of his virtue should not be too aggressively apparent to the innkeeper. It is to be imagined that the great powers, and the minor for that matter, are somewhat busily engaged in these days in tucking out of sight any dispensable emblems of a too arrogant morality when the word "China" is mentioned.

To the plain man, ungifted with the political conscience, for the quality of statesmanship may be summarily dismissed from the present hearing, it is almost impossible to comprehend how the peace conference succeeded in persuading itself that the wrong done to China in Shantung could be worth any right gained from Japan in the league of nations or elsewhere. It will be remembered that when, in the ducal court in Venice, Bassanio pleaded with the "young doctor of Rome," by name Balthasar, that he should "To do a great right, do a little wrong," that second Daniel swept away the Jesuitism of the suggestion with the words—

"'Twill be recorded for a precedent,
And many an error, by the same example,
Will rush into the state: it can not be."

It was, of course, not Balthasar, not Portia, who was speaking in those lines, but the great poet-philosopher of Elizabethan England. He saw clearly enough where playing politics with principle headed for, and it is wonderful that the peace council, with three centuries in which to learn wisdom, and better the example, were at the end of that time simply left tucking up their aprons.

This Shantung affair, then, is manifestly, whether politically or not, one of those matters which, with all respect to Mister Shandy, Tristram of that ilk, they do not order better in France. There is obviously no hope to be sought in Paris, and equally so none to be discovered in London, tied up as Downing Street is in a nefarious bargain with France and Japan. So it is to the Senate of the United States that the eyes of the world are turning, and on the Senate lies the burden of a great responsibility. It is being asked with the dulcet pleading of Bassanio to do a little wrong in order to accomplish a great right. But, in the first place, is it quite certain that the arbitrary disposal of the rights of 36,000,000 of people, and "also much cattle," is such a little wrong? And, in the second place, is it proven that the inclusion of Japan in the league of nations is so mighty a right, after all? On whom exactly would disaster have fallen if Japan had decided to remain outside the league?

The truth of the matter is that, at the great card party in Paris, so far as can be judged—for the game was played with the cards anywhere but on the table—Japan risked a simply tremendous bluff and never had it called. It is quite true that the Japanese delegates were aware that, owing to existing treaty arrangements, they had France and the British Commonwealth in the pockets of their kimonos, if kimonos have such things. It is also true that they were aware that the attention of Italy was focused on Fiume, and that the delegates from Rome were murmuring only that and nothing else, always excepting, of course, everything that had gone before. So that it comes to this—if anyone is going to stand between Japan and its prey, if anyone is going to forbid the rape of Shantung, it will be aut Senatus aut nullus—the Senate or nobody. Can anybody see any difference between the rape of Belgium and the rape of Shantung except this, that in the one case the British Commonwealth and France urged Belgium to stand firm, and they would come to her assistance, while in the other case those great powers became participants in the crime.

What, then, is the Senate going to do? It depends, surely, whether it decides to view the question from the point of view of statesmanship or politics. Politics will urge it to ratify, and have done with a troublesome business. Statesmanship will compel it to face the vast range of probabilities and problems which lie behind a too easy acceptance, to examine them, and to insist on the reopening of the question. The future, not the mere immediate political future of the United States but of world diplomacy and good faith among nations, lies in the decision. "I claim," said Abraham Lincoln once, "not to have controlled events but confess plainly that events have controlled me."

MR. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] yesterday made what was called a keynote speech with reference to the league. I presume it was made in a measure authoritatively. The Senator did not say so, but the presumption is it was a speech which had the approval of those who are most interested in the league. I want to read a paragraph from that speech and then to ask the friends who are supporting this league if they understand this to be its correct interpretation. The Senator from Virginia said:

Article 1 has the following provision:
 "Any member of the league may, after two years' notice of intention so to do, withdraw from the league, provided that all international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of withdrawal."

The requirement of two years' notice is reasonable, as no member should be permitted suddenly to terminate so important an engagement. Neither would it be just for a member to escape its accrued international and covenant obligations by withdrawing. Members that receive the benefits of the league should also bear its burdens. Especially would the United States scorn to avail herself of the privilege of retiring from the league without fully and honorably discharging every obligation. The contention that the United States could not withdraw without the unanimous consent of the council or assembly, the only bodies that can act for the league, is wholly untenable. No power whatever is conferred upon either of these bodies to act upon this question; no authority is given anywhere to compel the retention of a member after giving the required notice of withdrawal.

There is only one construction to be placed upon that language; in fact, it is too plain to call for construction. The clear import of the language is that a nation may withdraw upon its own motion by the simple act of giving notice; and that whether or not it has performed its international obligations or its obligations to the league is a matter to be determined by the nation itself which is seeking to withdraw. Is that the construction placed upon this clause by the advocates of the league? Is it understood here and now that the United States may after it enters this league—if it does—give its notice and at the end of two years may withdraw, whether the other members of the league or the council or the assembly are satisfied with the withdrawal or not? If that is the construction which is to be placed upon this proposition, then one course may be pursued here with reference to amendments. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he understands that the United States has a right to withdraw from the league upon the simple fact of giving notice, and that no other member of the league can object that the United States has not complied with or has not fulfilled its international obligations or its covenant obligations?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suppose the question as to whether the United States in such a case had fulfilled its international obligations would be, in the first place, a question which would present itself to the conscience of the United States. I suppose, in the second place, if the other nations which are members of the league differ from the United States about that, they would express their difference.

Mr. BORAH. If they did object, could the United States still withdraw? Would it have a right under the covenant to withdraw?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The United States could physically remain absent, but it would be subject to the obligations which it had incurred to the league, whatever the league decided they were—

Mr. BORAH. Oh, precisely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After the United States had put its interpretation upon them. I will say further that I can not imagine a case in which the United States would withdraw if the United States thought there was any obligation resting upon it—

Mr. BORAH. Precisely so; but can the United States be the sole judge?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or if the league thought there were any obligations resting upon the United States.

Mr. BORAH. What I desire to know is: Has the United States a right under the league covenant to interpret its own right to withdraw, and, if the United States says that it has performed its international obligations and has performed its covenant obligations, has any member of the council the right to say "nay"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not any member alone; but the league, by unanimous vote of all the other powers—I am not an expert judge, the Senator understands—might, I should say, if I were going to construe it, say, "We do not think that the United States has complied with its obligation, whatever it is," and then the question would come before the league to be decided.

Mr. BORAH. And if the league decides that we have not fulfilled our international obligations?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we would be theoretically and technically a member of the league, though we might be absent physically, until we did comply with the obligations.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, of course, you can not take away the right of revolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say, if the Senator will pardon me, you can not enter into any agreement where there are obligations on the part of other people to you and to the body of which you are a member without your having obligations to that body also. That goes without saying; it is common sense.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I supposed until I heard the Senator from Virginia make the address to which I have referred and to which I wish to call the Senator's attention, for he says:

The contention that the United States could not withdraw without the unanimous consent of the council or assembly, the only bodies that can act for the league, is wholly untenable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; that is untenable. That is not the statement the Senator made or the one I made. I said that the United States could not be retained except by the unanimous consent of the league.

Mr. BORAH. Well, if the United States seeks to withdraw, then it takes the unanimous consent of the council—

Mr. WILLIAMS. To keep it there.

Mr. BORAH. To keep it there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Even technically and theoretically; but I wish to add that practically, if they wanted to keep the United States in the league and we had determined that we had complied with every obligation and would not stay, they would have but one way of compelling us, and that would be to make war upon us, which is absolutely inconceivable.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I do not know. The ex-President of the United States, Mr. Taft, in New York sometime ago, when asked whether the United States if it entered this league could withdraw, said in reply, "You know what experience the Southern States had."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think there is a vast difference between a constitution which makes a Federal State and a constitution which makes a confederacy for certain purposes, just as much as there was between the old Government under the Continental Congress and the Government which was framed under the new Constitution. There was some grounds—and I believe that even the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will agree with me about this—for the South's contention that she had a technical constitutional or legal right to withdraw even from a Federal State like this. A fortiori could there be any dispute at all about the right to withdraw from a mere league like this? Nobody is calling this a Federal State, not even a supergovernment; it is a mere league of nations. It was what Calhoun contended the United States was.

Mr. BORAH. Then, as I understand the position of the Senator, it is that, being a mere league of nations, the United States may withdraw whenever it gets ready to give notice, and that nobody can object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I did not say that.

Mr. BORAH. I mean nobody can legally object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that; I said they could legally and technically object; that they could say, "Here is an obligation of the United States not complied with, and therefore she ought not to withdraw." Then the United States might reconsider her position, and she would determine either that she would or that she would not. She might say, "Very well; that is true; I will fulfill that obligation, and that will make my connection with the league terminate," or she might say, "I contend that I have fulfilled the obligation, and I will not go back into the league."

Mr. BORAH. Well, that is revolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then there will be no way left except for the league, by unanimous vote, to undertake to coerce her.

Mr. BORAH. Then I ask the Senator this question: Has the council or the assembly any power whatever to pass upon the question of the right of a country to withdraw?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should think so, reasoning from mere common sense.

Mr. BORAH. I had thought so, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The sole right that they have in that respect is to determine whether there is any existing outstanding obligation; that is all.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Virginia says that no power whatever is conferred upon either of these bodies, to wit, the council or the assembly, upon this question of withdrawal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not help that. If I were to quote all the various assertions made upon the other side in opposition, so variant with one another and so far apart from one another, you might set them against one another and cancel them off; but I do not think you can cancel a right interpretation of an instrument by quoting some other interpretation. I do not contend that my interpretation is necessarily right; I am no judge. That would be a rather judicial function.

Mr. BORAH. I insist that we go back to our late leader, and get the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to give his construction of it, because those of us who are seeking to find out what this means are entitled to know from those who are advocating its adoption what the construction is which they, as advocates of its adoption, place upon this important

proposition. There is not any more important clause in the league covenant than the right of withdrawal. If the Senator from Virginia be correct that neither the council nor the assembly has any power whatever to pass upon this question, this debate, of course, will take an entirely different turn upon that proposition; and if anybody knows, including the President or Mr. Lansing, what construction was placed upon it by the conference itself, we are entitled to have that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly, and by the way, Mr. President, if it had been necessary in framing the Constitution of the United States to frame it so that there could never be a lawsuit over its different provisions, our ancestors made some grave mistakes. I do not know how many lawsuits have grown out of the interpretation of the various clauses of the Constitution. I read once that there had been 134 law cases growing out of one clause alone. I do not know whether or not that is true; but that does not militate against the desirability of trying to do a thing. The human language is as weak as a human being; nobody yet was ever able to frame an instrument of any sort whose interpretation could not be disputed.

Mr. BORAH. I do not contend that at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My interpretation is worth about as little as that of anybody you could ask, I reckon.

Mr. BORAH. I would not say that; I think the Senator has very great ability in the construction of legislative proposals, and I think the Senator from Virginia has also. Therefore I am utterly bewildered to know how I shall get out of this league if I get in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You will have to get in before you can get out.

Mr. BORAH. I am satisfied it will take longer to get out than it will to get in, it does not make any difference what the construction may be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope so.

Mr. BORAH. But this is the situation: There is no more important article in the covenant than the right of withdrawal. If the right of withdrawal rests alone with the United States, if it can step out whenever it feels that it desires to go out and can step out with honor, having fulfilled its obligations, both legal and moral, according to its judgment, if it is understood by the Versailles conference that the United States can step out whenever it gives notice, that is one thing and it is a very important thing; but if, on the other hand, the council or the assembly has a right to pass upon the question and it takes unanimous consent to agree to our withdrawal, that is a wholly different proposition.

While the Senator says that no instrument can be drawn which will not give rise to dispute at some time in the future, yet we are here making this instrument, we are still writing this instrument, for we are a part of the treaty-making power; and if we assent to an instrument and ask our people to enter into an obligation which we ourselves do not understand and which we confess we do not understand in a matter of such tremendous moment to them—if we do that, shall we have performed our duty in the writing of the treaty upon which the peace of the world is to rest in the future?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my answer to that would be twofold. In the first place, we are not all of the treaty-making power; we are a part of the treaty-making power of one nation. All of the nations have to agree to the treaty. That is the reply to that. Now, I reply—

Mr. BORAH. It is not a reply, because, while we are only one member, we represent ourselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the Senator. The Senate has a right to amend; but it has got to go back and get the consent of the others.

As to the other proposition, the Senator says it is something that we do not understand ourselves. In my profession of humility about not being a judge, I am not confessing that I do not understand it. I understand it; I put my construction upon it, and it is very clear to me; but whether it be right or not is a matter for other intellects to struggle with as well as mine.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, we seem to have arrived at a point where there is a disagreement between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Virginia as to this—

Mr. WILLIAMS. That seems to be true, from what the Senator has read from the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BORAH. Because the Senator from Virginia says:

The contention that the United States could not withdraw without the unanimous consent of the council or assembly, the only bodies that can act for the league, is wholly untenable. No power whatever is conferred upon either of these bodies to act upon this question; no authority is given anywhere to compel the retention of a member after giving the required notice of withdrawal.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Awhile ago in the Senator's remarks he referred to treaties with China, which he asserted committed us to the proposal that we should protect the territorial integrity of the Chinese Empire. Did I understand the Senator to say that he is going to insert a reference to those treaties in his remarks?

Mr. BORAH. I think I can get them in just a moment. I will insert them in my speech if I do not get them; but I will get them in a few moments—will kill time until I do get them.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by Mr. Elmer T. Peterson, editor of the Wichita Beacon, to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with reference to a ballot which was taken in that part of the country on the league of nations. This letter was written in reply to a statement made by the Senator from Nebraska that no reference could be made to any instance in which a vote had been taken or public opinion tested which was not overwhelmingly for the league. I ask to insert this letter and also the form of the ballot.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

JULY 5, 1919.

Hon. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HITCHCOCK: On page 2067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 30, 1919, you are quoted as saying, "I challenge the Senator from Idaho to refer me to any test made anywhere to show the state of public opinion on this league that is not favorable to it."

We can very readily cite a most conclusive and convincing test of that kind.

The Beacon conducted a poll, open to anybody, using a ballot, a sample of which is inclosed. The result showed that there were only 37 in favor of the present covenant, while 863 were dissatisfied with it and desired either to amend it or reject it altogether; 457 were wholly against any league. The votes for suggested amendments were:

To protect the Monroe doctrine	299
To safeguard immigration, labor, trade, Panama Canal, etc.	406
To guard against sending soldiers to other countries (art. 10)	344
In favor of covenant as it stands	37
Wholly against any league	457

The answers were mostly from farmers and people of small towns. The farmers were most strongly against the league. I still have the letters accompanying the ballots, and they are a revelation, showing a very decided sentiment against the present covenant. I consider this a far more reliable and convincing test of the opinion of the "plain people" than that of the Literary Digest, for instance.

The reason we got this result was because we put the question in a plain, straightforward way, whereas all of the other test votes I have noticed put the question in a manner which gave the league a decided advantage. Of course, 9 people out of 10 would vote for "an organization of nations to promote peace," or something of the kind, but when the covenant stands on its merits and the questions are put straight, as they were in this questionnaire, the sentiment is overwhelmingly against the kind of a project you and some of your colleagues are trying to saddle on the United States, and when the people fully realize what it all means, when all the camouflage and rhetoric is stripped off and the true meaning of articles 10 and 11 and other features is known, you can depend upon it that there will be a tremendous revolution of feeling against you and those who stand with you on this question.

Senator CAPPER, who has kept an open mind on the league question, writes me that this questionnaire is the best he has seen. Since challenges are in order, I challenge you, as leader of the pro-covenant forces, to put such a questionnaire before the people of the United States. Undoubtedly you know in your heart that the result would be disastrous for your side of the question.

The trouble is that most of the people have not read the covenant and are taking the word of leaders for certain things. This is a very inconclusive and unsatisfactory state of affairs. The league advocates contradict each other as to what the covenant means. Some of them say it is like our American Constitution, which would, of course, make the league a superstate, while others say it is not a superstate and has no power except to recommend or advise action. And so on. As I understand the situation, all the covenant critics ask is that the people be given an opportunity to study the whole thing carefully upon a set of "interpretations," which can be agreed upon by both sides to the controversy, if such a thing is possible, and then vote. If it is impossible to obtain an interpretation of this kind, let the plain words of the English language stand for what they say.

Would the people of the United States have indorsed President Wilson in guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of Serbia in July, 1914, league or no league? They would not. Will they indorse any future President in guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of any country in a similar case in the future, league or no league? Let your knowledge of human nature answer.

It is idle to say that "this league" is the only league that is before the American people; in fact, it is a slur at American intelligence. The people of a city may be in favor of giving a street car company a franchise, but they are not going to accept any kind of a franchise that the company may feel like presenting. They want to know what it all means, and they have a perfect right to amend the franchise and strike out certain features. The Beacon contended ever since the armistice that some kind of a league was needed, but this does not mean that we have to support the precise instrument that was handed down from Paris. To say that we must take "this league" or nothing is to deny the American people the right of a voice in their own affairs. I do not need to argue this, for you are so intelligent that you know it without argument.

I inclose a copy of the ballot that we used, showing the total votes on each proposition. If you will read the result into the RECORD, along with the other votes of which you have spoken, it may serve to throw a little light by showing the intelligent discrimination shown by Kansas people.

Very truly, yours,

(Copies to Senators BORAH and LODGE.)

Associate Editor.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS BALLOT.

Put a cross in the square opposite the statement or statements that most nearly express your opinion. Cut out this ballot and mail it to the league poll editor, the Beacon, Wichita, Kans., or drop it in ballot box in the Beacon's business office.

I favor the proposed league of nations constitution as published, without amendment, 37.

I favor a league of nations constitution amended so as to protect the Monroe doctrine in specific language, 299.

I favor a league of nations with constitution amended so as to safeguard American rights in matters of immigration, naturalization, labor, trade, and the Panama Canal, in specific language, 406.

I favor a league of nations with constitution amended specifically so that the United States can not be compelled to send soldiers to foreign countries to settle disputes as to boundaries, etc., 344.

I am wholly opposed to any league of nations, 457.

Name, Oscar Turner; address, Meno, Okla.

Mr. BORAH. I will yield the floor until I find the matter I have sent for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho, which would have been humorous to my mind if he had so intended them, and a great many other remarks that have been made in support of various little things about the treaty, call to my mind a piece of exquisite humor that I picked up some time ago, not of the very highest order, but very good, entitled "If the United States Senate debated 'Now I lay me down to sleep,'" by Clark McAdams, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I do not know the politics of that paper. Here is the debate that he says would take place in the Senate:

"FIRST SENATOR. I propose that we adopt for the youth of our Republic the following prayer, to be said before going to bed:

"Now I lay me down to sleep.
I pray the Lord my soul to keep.
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take.

"SECOND SENATOR. Mr. President, I protest against obligating the children of this country to any set prayer before they go to bed; but this is a Christian country, something of this sort is understood to be our duty to posterity, and I suppose we therefore must have it. If so, I want to see it given more elasticity. The first line says:

"Now I lay me down to sleep.

"That is unworthy of a free people. It is un-American. Must we lay down to sleep because the law says so, when it may suit the purposes of slumber better to sleep standing up? [Applause.] It is not established that we must lay down to sleep. As a matter of fact, it may be discovered at any moment that a recumbent or prostrate position is exactly that in which we get the least rest. Thousands of soldiers slept standing up in the trenches of France. I am told that most of those men continue to sleep standing up. They find they rest better. Moreover, they do not so completely surrender consciousness sleeping in that way as one does lying down. They wake easier, and their wits are not so sluggish. It is not certain that we should wholly surrender consciousness when we sleep. A good many eminent authorities think not. Certainly the soldier who slept with one eye open, so to speak, did not suffer by that experience. He is the best man among us to-day. Do you know anything about physiology, Mr. President? I am told that physiologically we ought never to sleep as this prayer says we must sleep. It is in an upright position that we are physiologically normal. You know how much trouble we have had with gasoline engines in airplanes because they were not originally suited to running in any save an upright position. They were not properly oiled when they ran on end. They were not properly cooled when they ran upside down. It is the same with us. We are physiologically exactly what we were when we first slept upright in trees and then leaned against the walls of a cave. Did you ever see a horse sleep, Mr. President? A horse almost always sleeps upright. Shall we say, then, that our children must all sleep, as this prayer says they must sleep, or shall we leave them free to sleep as they wish or as science shall discover how they should sleep? [Applause.] I am for the spirit of the prayer, but against the form."

This does not apply to the Senator from Idaho. He is against the form and the spirit also.

"Let us stick to our traditions.
Give us liberty or give us death.
Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said:
'This is my own my native land,
To rest in sleeping or to stand—
As Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John,
Who went to bed with their trousers on,
All exercised a freeman's voice
In making that historic choice?'
Breathes there a man with soul so dead
The law can stuff him into bed,
And through the long night watches keep
Its cruel vigil o'er his sleep?"

"[Laughter and applause.]

"THIRD SENATOR. Mr. President, the third line of this proposed prayer says:

"If I should die before I wake.

"That is absurd. How could one die before one wakes? As well say one died before one lived. It is the duty of the Senate to weigh words and to determine what they mean. We are here positing the impossible, a thing as unworthy of us as a deliberative body as it would be futile of us as givers of law. Are we, in agreeing upon a little prayer which our children may say before they go to bed, to plumb the depths of metaphysics and try arbitrarily to establish a fact of life which has resisted every research of science? [Applause.] I can not believe it. Why can not we make this read simply,

"If I should die—

"Which is probably all that would happen, without attempting to say that one dies before waking or involving ourselves in an interminable dispute over a point which has nothing whatever to do with getting our children reverently and sweetly to bed? [Laughter and applause.] Let us not, in freedom's name, undertake to establish in this body, without benefit of anything better than mere political science, that one dies before one wakes, or wakes before one dies, or attempt to say what happens in that hidden moment when the soul sets forth upon the great adventure of death! [Applause.] Let us concern ourselves with things of the state, which is our business, leaving things of the spirit to those trained in things of the spirit and things of the soul to those trained in things of the soul. Let us continue to be merely Republicans and Democrats [laughter], claiming to know only the things known by Republicans and Democrats [laughter], and not attempt to be metaphysicians or anything which everybody outside this Chamber, whether we know it or not, knows very well we are not. [Laughter and applause.]"

They know very well that we are not any very great judges, too, in interpreting things.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand that this poetry is relative to the views of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] as to article 1 in this treaty?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is relative to my view of some of these little bits of picayunish amendments offered by the opponents of the league of nations.

I read further:

"FOURTH SENATOR. Mr. President, I see nothing in the captiousness of these my opponents save their captiousness itself. [Laughter.] The expressions employed in this beautiful little prayer are merely forms of speech. They are not theological dogma, nor do they attempt to establish a point in dispute anywhere except, perhaps, between ourselves and the Mohammedans. [Laughter.] This prayer expresses a pretty sentiment. It is unfortunate that it does so in words. Words imply as many meanings as there are minds, and we construe them not by any common rule but according to whatever happens to be our belief. If this were not the most disputatious body on earth [laughter], if it did not put such a premium on cantankerousness as history has never seen equaled [laughter], and if it did not hold the motives of all men to be evil until they are by some miracle proven pure [laughter]—if this deplorable condition did not exist here, Mr. President, we would accept and ratify this prayer, happy in the confidence that our children, whose faith, thank God, is greater than our own, would be glad to say it with no thought that it might mean anything more than that through the night they are to be in the Lord's care. [Applause.] It is beneath our dignity as the most august deliberative body in a great Christian Nation to affect to see in it things no one ever dreamed of putting into it, and our grotesque attempts scientifically to analyze it reflect our own faultiness as a Senate rather than its faultiness as a prayer. [Laughter and applause.]"

That particular Senator seemed to have some gumption.

To continue the reading:

"FIFTH SENATOR. Mr. President, I yield to no man in acceptance of what is good, but our responsibility here is too great to accept anything blindly. The last line of this prayer says:

"I pray the Lord my soul to take.

"What do we know in this Chamber of the soul? Is the soul proven? Is it an accepted thing? Did this body ever say so? Did George Washington ever say so? Is it something established to everybody's satisfaction—a thing past debate in the Senate, and now to be recognized in law? Are we going on from this point to establish the status of soul mates [laughter], and to say finally whether or not corporations have souls? [Laughter.] Mr. President, we tread here upon ground so dangerous that we are likely to be blown up any minute. After centuries of debates among the most learned men the world has known—from Soc-

rates, who died in the happiness of feeling that he would see and talk to Homer, down to Prof. Muensterberg, who went off wondering and promised to signal us if there proved to be anything in it—after all this, Mr. President, the United States is to affirm in the ratification of this prayer the stupendous postulate of immortality! [Laughter and applause.] Mr. President, I don't feel equal to it. [Laughter.] Can you imagine the amaze of a world totally unprepared for any such affirmation from this quarter? [Laughter.] Let us not do that. Let us leave that great matter to those intellectual giants whose minds have never been ground down to the infinite detail of the senatorial function. [Laughter.] A man distributing postmasterships over a sparsely inhabited and none-too-well schooled commonwealth is not accustomed to orienting his thought unto the profound problem whether there is a life after this. [Laughter.]

"This is a sweet line:

"I pray the Lord my soul to take.

"It breathes the very spirit of our Christian land. It has in it all the ingeniousness of childhood. It reposes in, I think, an adequate quarter a beautiful trust. [Laughter.] Still, does the Senate want to make it something more than a matter of faith? Does it want to say it is so? No, Mr. President. We want to leave it just as it is. We want everyone quite free to make of it what he will, coerced by no one—least of all the Senate. [Applause.] It would, after everything else is said, be unconstitutional for us to do so. The Constitution guarantees religious freedom. This prayer implies a religious autocracy. Shall we treat our children any less fairly than we treat ourselves? Would we first ratify here a prayer and then require the Chaplain of the Senate to utter it whenever we convene? [Laughter and applause.] Anyway, who cares what the prayers of a Nation are so long as we can make its laws? [Prolonged applause.]

"SIXTH SENATOR. Information has just reached me of an amazing discourtesy to us all. Copies of this prayer have been in possession of Wall Street for two weeks! [Consternation.]"

Mr. BORAH. Two weeks? He is mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Two weeks he says; I leave questions of time to the author and to the Senator from Idaho to settle. Still continuing the reading:

"Incredible as it is that Wall Street could be interested in any prayer [laughter], I am informed that so far as the important centers of thought and action in this country go ours is about the last to come into possession of this one or to ascertain what is in it. [Groans.] This being the case, I must hold that the prayer is not something with which the Senate can in its dignity at this time have anything whatever to do. [Applause.] Our children can continue to go to bed in the way they have been going to bed. [Applause.] We are perfectly willing to take our chances with Providence, but we won't take any chance with Wall Street. [Laughter and cheers.]"

Mr. President, I read this because I wanted it published in large print instead of small print, as it would have been had I gotten leave to insert in the Record; and I do think that as a travesty upon a great deal of tweedledumming and tweedledeeing, and a great deal of "splitting hairs betwixt the nor' and nor'west sides" it is altogether malapropos.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Listening to this exquisite piece of humor and sarcasm which has just been read into the Record by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the wish struck me that the author might know a little more of the true inwardness of legislation and discussion in the Senate. If the author lived nearer or was a little more familiar with Washington and with proceedings in the Senate than he is in the backwoods of St. Louis, he would know that if that prayer had been offered here by a Republican for indorsement, immediately one of the Senators upon the opposite side would have risen and objected, and proceeded to make a speech upon Shantung or some other proposition, or engage in just such discussion as the Senator has been reading, while he would say to one of his companions, "Run, run to the telephone and find out whether or not the President wants this indorsement of the prayer," and upon the telephone being rung, and it being discovered that the President was out engaged in a game of golf, he would say, "Well, then, tell Tumulty just what is going on, that a Republican has offered a prayer here, and we do not know whether we should vote for the indorsement until we hear from the President"; and the answer would come back, "Fillbuster; fillbuster until the President can return and his wishes be known!"

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from New Mexico for being almost equal in power as a fiction maker with the other funny man who wrote the article which I read.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I compliment myself at least upon being original, and not being compelled to retail fiction by reading from articles in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall continue to take counsel from my intellectual humility and modesty, which recognizes a good thing, even though I did not originate it. I shall permit the Senator from New Mexico to take counsel from his egotism, which recognizes nothing but his own originality. There are a great many things that I read that are a great deal better than anything that I can say, perhaps even better than a very few things the Senator says that do not come up to his usual standard.

Mr. FALL. There is no doubt about that, Mr. President; and sometimes I think the Senator is justified in his course in reading into the Record in every debate editorials or fiction from some fiction writer. However, the real objection that the Senator from Mississippi has, if he has any, to the little statement I have made is that it is an everyday occurrence, with which he is familiar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that also demonstrates how powerfully a man can draw upon his imagination. Sometimes you draw upon it and at first know it is a dream and do not believe it; then you make a second draft, and a third, and a fourth, and after a while you get to the point where you really believe the draft is genuine and will be honored in the court of fact.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am very fond of the Senator from Mississippi, but I think his taste for poetry is perfectly rotten.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that was not poetry. That was prose. The Senator is like the old woman who was very much astonished to find, after she was 70 years old and wanted to know what prose was, that she had been talking prose all her life.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair [Mr. Wolcott] asked that I insert in the Record the treaties to which I made reference:

The Franco-Japanese treaty, which was signed in June, 1907.

The Japan-United States-Russia-Denmark agreement, signed in November, 1908.

The Russo-Japanese convention, signed in July, 1907.

The Anglo-Japanese alliance, signed the last time in July, 1911.

These treaties are found in full in the appendix of a book entitled "Our Eastern Question," by Thomas F. Millar. I think that is a sufficient identification.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether any notices have been given for addresses on Thursday of this week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Wolcott in the chair). The Chair is advised that no such notices have been given.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will give notice, then, that I shall submit some observations on the Shantung question on Thursday, after the completion of the routine morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended, reported by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I ask leave in this connection to print the statement from the Far Eastern Review and also a memorandum of the Far Eastern Bureau, which contains a very full account of the alleged treaty and also the text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ALLEGED SECRET JAPANESE-GERMAN TREATY.

The following is the draft of the alleged German-Japan treaty of 1918, with explanatory note. It is a copy of a document taken from the official files of the central soviet papers in the Bolshevik archives at Perm on February 2 of this year, when the anti-Bolshevik army ejected the Bolsheviks from the town. The document was obtained by Maj. Slaughter, United States Army, attached to the Siberian army for special service, and was telegraphed in cypher on February 22 from Ekaterinburg to Vladivostok, and thence again in cypher to Washington and Europe.

It is stated that the Bolshevik ambassador to Berlin procured the details of the alleged treaty after the German revolution and the sacking of the German state archives, and telegraphed them to Russia, and as the result the following appeared in the official "Izvestia" of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, Nos. 255 (519) and 256 (520) of November 22 and 23, 1918:

From fully reliable sources we are informed that:

At the end of October there was received fully reliable and exact information about the arrival in Stockholm of the Japanese Extraordinary Representative Oda, with the aim of carrying on secret conversation with the German ambassador Lutzius concerning the conclusion of a German-Japanese secret treaty. An agreement in principle was reached, after which Oda went to Berlin for the final working out of the treaty itself. The result of the conversation was the draft of a treaty, which, together with the explanatory note

attached, we here publish. We are reliably informed that of the German Government no other than Scheidemann supported the project in question, which was, on the other hand, opposed by the deputy of the center, Secretary of State Erzberger. The revolution which took place in Germany prevented the carrying out of the plan which was the expression of the idea of the treaty and which consisted in the following, namely, that a restoration be carried out in Russia by the forces of Germany and Japan and a German, Russian, Japanese alliance be formed in which Russia should be subordinated to the other two partners in the alliance. After the revolution this treaty became known in the German press and it was published by the Hamburg "Red Banner." This disclosure caused animated discussion and bitter polemic, in connection with which the press close to the German Government tried to refute the very fact of the existence of such a draft. Material at our disposal, however, does not leave the slightest doubt of the authenticity of the documents published by us, all the more that in the composition of the present Japanese Cabinet entered one of the most important Japanese statesmen of German orientation, Gen. Tanaka, minister of war, whose pronouncement on the 7th of May, 1917, in defense of an alliance with Germany provoked at that time the protest of all the Allies. Furthermore, from the documents earlier published by the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs it is manifested that efforts toward the conclusion of a separate peace and an alliance between Germany, Russia, and Japan were made by the German Government in March, 1916, by the German ambassador in Stockholm, that same Lutzius, through the Japanese ambassador Uchida (Uchida).

DRAFT OF THE GERMAN-JAPANESE TREATY.
(Strictly confidential.)

PARAGRAPH 1. Both high contracting parties bind themselves as soon as the world political situation permits, to help the third party, Russia, to obtain under their direction the settlement of her internal affairs and the position of a world power.

PAR. 2. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself to allow the other high contracting party, Germany, the enjoyment of the prerogatives growing out of her treaties with the third party, Russia, as far as they concern Central Asia and Persia and assist in the conclusion of a most favored nation treaty with mutual (reciprocal) guarantees between the third power and the two contracting powers.

PAR. 3. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself to allow the other contracting party, Germany, the enjoyment of the rights of most favored nation given to her by the treaties in southern China and of certain privileges growing out of this treaty as yet to be defined in a special treaty, and in this connection both contracting parties bind themselves not to allow the passing of further concessions, in regions yet to be definitely defined, into the hands of foreign powers—America and England.

PAR. 4. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself indirectly to protect the interests of the other high contracting party, Germany, in the coming peace conference, in a manner agreeable to that party in order that she might suffer as little as possible from the onerous terms of peace in respect to territorial and financial losses.

PAR. 5. One of the two high contracting parties binds herself, on the basis of a treaty to be concluded with the third power after her restoration, to secure for the other contracting party, Germany, the conclusion of a treaty of mutual (reciprocal) guarantees, military, political, and economic, and to lend her services to the other party, Germany, in this direction.

PAR. 6. In return for this the other high contracting party, Germany, binds herself to conclude a secret military convention on land and sea with the aim of an alliance of mutual (reciprocal) guarantees and mutual protection against the aggressive intentions of America and England, the details to be worked out immediately after the conclusion of peace by specially empowered delegates of both high contracting parties.

PAR. 7. The secret treaty resulting herefrom will define the basic lines of foreign policy of the three high contracting parties and may in its full extent and in all its individual paragraphs be worked out immediately after the reestablishing of the third high contracting party, Russia.

PAR. 8. The present treaty is concluded for a period of five years counting from the moment of the restoration of the third party, with the exception of paragraph 4, which goes into effect immediately upon receipt of certificates of ratification. In case none of the high contracting parties announces, six months before the end of the five years' period, the intention of discontinuing the action of the treaty, it automatically remains in force for a further five years' period, until one or another of the contracting powers signifies its intention of discontinuing it.

PAR. 9. The present treaty should be ratified as soon as possible and certificates of ratification should be prepared in duplicate in French and German, the German text being the authentic one for Germany and the French text for Japan.

EXPLANATORY NOTE ATTACHED.

The question whether the western orientation which German policy followed during the whole course of the war was the right one received such an exhaustive answer from the very course of the war and of events that it is doubtful if a critical consideration of it is valuable, the more so that at the present moment it has a merely historical interest and not any real significance. The western orientation brought with itself also the mistake that they (the Germans) did not wish to conclude peace with Russia, because they considered it possible to preserve the continued readiness to carry on the war among the Social Democratic sections of the German people possible only under the motto of the battle against reactionary czarism.

In direct contrast to this was the policy of Japan who concluded in the middle of the war an alliance with Russia, the full meaning of which, in view of the disintegration of Russia, lies in the future.

The existence in Germany of the idea that it would be possible to make peace with England at the expense of Russia, as circumstances showed, was not only unfounded but entailed serious consequences in internal politics for the German Federation of States and for her allies.

This was, however, not the only mistake of the political orientation in question. After Germany reached the conclusion that an agreement with England, either directly or through America, was impossible, she let the moment slip by for a timely agreement with Russia, by means of which she could have thrown over the hoped-for bridge to the Near and Far East.

In all probability by means of such an orientation Germany would have prevented the disintegration of Russia and would have protected and even strengthened her rear in the East in an economic, political, and military sense.

Further, it is unlikely that Bolshevism would have been able to obtain such a clear cut mastery in Russia as has been seen in the past 12 months. In all probability in the event of an Eastern orientation on the part of Germany, its progress or mastery would have been only a momentary phenomenon or episode, and at all events would not have brought on such heavy internal and external catastrophes for that State.

An Eastern orientation of Germany would place England face to face with the necessity of withdrawing from a purposeless war and becoming peace loving because as a result of constant loss of tonnage her future economic development would be under direct threat and a Russia supported by Germany would be a military and political danger to the vital nerves of Asia.

But if supported by Germany, Russia is already a mighty factor constituting a serious danger for England [causing her?] to exercise the greatest caution in carrying out her policy; so much the stronger would this factor be if Japan, supported on the Continent by Germany and Russia, should join the alliance. Such an orientation would constitute a very great danger for America and England.

From the foregoing it follows that the center of gravity of future world politics lies in the reestablishment of a Russia freed of Bolshevism and supported from outside for a number of years in which Germany and Japan would be equally interested.

From this Japan would gain the advantage by virtue of the treaty of mutual support with Germany and Russia; she would become a very strong military force with which America would have to reckon, all the more so that the divergence between England and America on the basis of the self-determination of nations is only a matter of time.

The new political alliance would mean a double advantage, both a political and an economical one, as she (Russia) would be economically strengthened by Germany and Japan, and would be politically protected against English and American aggression while she would again rise to the position of a world power.

For Germany economic advantage would be in the form of considerable concessions in Turkestan, thanks to which she could make herself independent of America in cotton and paper. In a political and military sense Germany would receive full cover for her rear on land through Russia and on sea through Japan.

The final end of such an alliance would be the complete removal of England from Asia, the isolation of England from America, through Canada and India, and the economic expulsion of America from Siberia and England from Russia on the one hand and the exploitation of China, Central Asia, and Persia on the other, the spheres of influence being divided according to the following boundaries: Germany receives freedom of action in South China, Persia, and Central Asia, while Japan can declare her pretensions to northern China, Manchuria, Korea, and Eastern Siberia.

[Memorandum re alleged German-Japanese alliance relative to Russia and China by G. Charles Hodges, assistant director.]
(Treaty text over.)

SOURCE OF DOCUMENT.

The text of this alleged German-Japanese (Russian) alliance was secured by the representative of the Soviet Republic in Berlin following the German revolution and the sacking of the State archives. The Bolshevik ambassador telegraphed it to Russia, where it appeared in the official organ of the "All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets" (the *Isvestia*).

The United States came into possession of this document about two months afterwards, where it was found among the Bolshevik archives at Perm, Siberia, following the capture of that place by the anti-Bolshevik forces, February 2, 1919. (Agreement originally published Nov. 22-23, 1919, in the *Isvestia*, issues No. 255 (519) and No. 256 (520) in Petrograd.)

The transmitter was, it is said, Maj. Slaughter, United States Army, detailed on special service to Siberia.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN POSSESSION OF TEXT.

We understand this text to have been regarded as important enough in Siberia to telegraph it in cipher, February 22, 1919, from Ekaterinburg to Vladivostok, where it was again put into cipher and cabled to the United States.

The contents thus should have reached the Department of State by March 1, as well as the British and French foreign offices, about the same time.

CHINA FORCES PUBLICITY.

Public knowledge of this alleged transaction came from our associate in the Great War, the Republic of China. Coming into possession of this document from another source the Chinese Government cabled its contents to the Paris conference.

ALLIANCE OF OCTOBER, 1918, SECOND ENTENTE (NOT ALLEGED JAPANESE-GERMAN TREATY OF MARCH, 1916).

The significance of this second disclosure—entirely different from one of three years ago—can not be overlooked. During 1918 it was denied by England, France, and Japan, as well as subsequently discredited by America, that the alleged arrangements made between Germany and Japan concluded by Lutzius (for Germany) and Uchida (the Japanese ambassador to Russia then and now foreign minister) in March, 1916, in Sweden, had any validity, published in Russia by the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.

Neither the British nor French foreign offices, or the Department of State, however, have given an official verdict.

If they were willing to scout the validity of the first alleged German-Japanese pact of 1916, why should these powers not do the same to this second treaty of October, 1918?

Is the answer in the matter that the second document can not be so denied; that there are diplomatic grounds for its existence?

ALLEGED GERMAN-JAPANESE NEGOTIATIONS, 1916.

This pact, neither confirmed nor denied by the powers affected, is said to have been negotiated in its preliminaries at Stockholm. Japan was represented by an obscure official named Oda, Germany again by Lutzius. Conversations were begun in the latter part of October, 1918.

An agreement in principle being reached, the final draft was made in Berlin.

As for the German attitude, Scheidemann is said to have supported the move, while Erzberger headed the opposition. The document came out during the collapse of Imperial Germany, the Hamburg Red Banner being the first to publish it.

VALIDITY OF THE PACT BY INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

The alleged pact has a comprehensiveness and carries a statesmanship which the first agreement published lacked. The historical setting of the new disclosures puts its consummation at the time Prince Max of Baden was in power. While this was a moment when the German armies were in retreat on the west front, the alliance showed considerable internal evidence of farsighted statecraft. (See Provisions, which clearly show this to be a logical reinsurance treaty, realizing that Germany had been defeated.)

Furthermore, ex-Premier Terauchi declared in the spring of 1918 that an alliance with Germany was a possible development of Japanese statecraft. Moreover, Lieut. Gen. Tanaka, subsequently war minister under Terauchi, stated openly that Japan should have a German alliance. This statement of May 7, 1917, aroused allied objections.

RELATION TO NEW REGIONAL UNDERSTANDING OF 1919.

This German-Japanese combination may be an important element in the present relations between Japan and Britain and France at present, explaining the rumored willingness of the two latter powers to divide the east with Japan along terms paralleling those alleged above.

POWERS WILL NOT REFUDIATE TREATY UNLESS BOLSHIEVİK FORGERY.

A statement from Germany or the evasive denial of the alleged pact's validity recently made by Minister Obata in Peking, on behalf of Japan, will not carry any weight.

Nothing may be expected to be forthcoming from the powers affected unless they are convinced that it is a Bolshievik forgery.

DRAFT OF ALLEGED CONVENTION.

(Strictly confidential.)

Paragraph 1. Both high contracting parties bind themselves, as soon as the world political situation permits, to help the third party, Russia, to obtain under their direction the settlement of her internal affairs and the position of a world power.

Par. 2. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself to allow the other high contracting party, Germany, the enjoyment of the prerogatives growing out of her treaties with the third party, Russia, as far as they concern central Asia and Persia and assist in the conclusion of a most-favored-nation treaty with mutual (reciprocal) guarantees between this third power and the two contracting powers.

Par. 3. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself to allow the other contracting party, Germany, the enjoyment of the rights of most favored nation given to her by the treaties in southern China, and of certain privileges growing out of this treaty as yet to be defined in a special treaty, and in this connection both contracting parties bind themselves not to allow the passing of further concessions in regions yet to be definitely defined into the hands of foreign powers—America and England.

Par. 4. One of the high contracting parties, Japan, binds herself indirectly to protect the interests of the other high contracting party, Germany, in the coming peace conference, in a manner agreeable to that party in order that she might suffer as little as possible from the onerous terms of peace in respect to territorial and financial losses.

Par. 5. One of the two high contracting parties binds herself on the basis of a treaty to be concluded with the third power after her restoration to secure for the other contracting party, Germany, the conclusion of a treaty of mutual (reciprocal) guarantees, military, political, and economic, and to lend her services to the other party, Germany, in this direction.

Par. 6. In return for this the other high contracting party, Germany, binds herself to conclude a secret military convention on land and sea with the aim of an alliance of mutual (reciprocal) guarantees and mutual protection against the aggressive intentions of America and England, the details to be worked out immediately after the conclusion of peace by specially empowered delegates of both high contracting parties.

Par. 7. The secret treaty resulting herefrom will define the basic lines of foreign policy of the three high contracting parties, and may in its full extent and in all its individual paragraphs be worked out immediately after the reestablishment of the third high contracting party, Russia.

Par. 8. The present treaty is concluded for a period of five years counting from the moment of the restoration of the third party, with the exception of paragraph 4, which goes into effect immediately upon receipt of ratification. In case none of the high contracting parties announces six months before the end of the five-year period the intention of discontinuing the action of the treaty, it automatically remains in force for a further five-year period, until one or another of the contracting parties signifies its intention of discontinuing it.

Par. 9. The present treaty should be ratified as soon as possible and certificates of ratification should be prepared in duplicate in French and German, the German text being the authentic one for Germany and the French text for Japan.

EDEL FORD'S EXEMPTION CASE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago, seeking to inform myself and to refresh my memory, I went to the War Department in order to find some evidence on the returns made by the local boards from the State of Michigan, to prepare myself for an election contest pending here, which some time will be heard. The Secretary of War, through The Adjutant General, refused me access to the public records. I have no right to see the questionnaires in those matters. They are sealed up, and are not matters of public record; but under the rules of the War Department, or the Provost Marshal General, rather, the second edition, and especially under section 11 of the rules, all except the matters relating to the family history and the physical and mental examination of the registrant are declared to be public records. I sought to see those public records, and that right was denied me by the Secretary of War. I have prepared my views on that question; but owing to the lateness of the hour I do not care to make an address on the subject, but I ask to have them printed. I think they will be sufficiently illuminating without any oral utterance. I ask that they be printed in the ordinary type and not in small type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that a request to print remarks, more or less in the nature of a leave to print, has never been granted in the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I will read it or I will speak it. I desired to save the time, but I appreciate that a precedent ought not to be made.

A NATIONAL SCANDAL.

I recently applied to Secretary of War Baker to read the records in the Edsel Ford exemption case. The Secretary denied the right, saying through The Adjutant General that matters mental and physical and family dependency were so mingled with the other records as to make it improper. Those exempted subjects are all in the sealed questionnaire, and are in no way connected with the public records of the Ford exemption. The Secretary knows this. His action is solely to shield a presidential pet, who was kept out of the military service of the United States by a gross abuse of Executive power. Secretary Baker conceals the proof of the President's favoritism in this case and his own connivance with it as Secretary of War. The humble citizen with a wife and child but no millionaire father and order from the President to exempt him from the service may well doubt the good faith of the executive heads who apply the draft law. The young man who left his family to live on \$30 a month and his wife's efforts would like to read the public record of Edsel Ford's exemption. It is a disgraceful affair, and Secretary Baker well knows the only safety for the President and himself is in suppressing the record of it.

Henry Ford is asking to unseat the sitting Member from Michigan who ran against him last November. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and desired to inspect those records as material evidence in that contest. Henry Ford alleges votes were had against him by the corrupt use of money. I wish to examine his course in procuring the exemption of his son from military service, and the President's orders to that end, to show Ford was defeated by the people of Michigan in resentment and disgust at such discrimination. That evidence was denied me, and so much of my preparation of the hearing of that contest waits.

In the absence of a reading of the records, I am compelled to rely on secondary evidence. Any inaccuracies which may appear are due to this lack of primary evidence.

An examination of the rule shows that it was drafted for the sole purpose of creating exemptions. I read from page 8 of Selective Service Regulations (second edition), section 11:

All records required by these rules and regulations to be filed with and kept by local and district boards, adjutants general, and other persons in connection with the registration, examination, selection, and mobilization of registrants under the selective-service law, and these regulations shall be public records and shall be open during usual business hours for public inspection of any and all persons. (See sec. 12.)

Provided, however, That the answers of any registrant concerning the condition of his health, mental or physical, in response to Series II of the questions under the head entitled "Physical fitness" in the questionnaire, and other evidence and records upon the same subject, and the answer of any registrant to the questions under series X of the questions under the head entitled "Dependency" in the questionnaire, except the names and addresses of the persons claimed to be dependent upon such registrants, shall not, without the consent of the registrant, be open to inspection by any person other than members of local and district boards.

And so forth, naming other officers.

Now that the President is again on his native soil he might profitably give attention to this national scandal, which begun at his table and reached back to Detroit, Mich. Three hundred and sixty-eight thousand and sixty-four men registered in Michigan for military service June 5, 1917. Among them was Edsel Ford, son of Henry Ford, late a candidate for Senator in that State, and is now a contestant for a seat in this body.

Edsel Ford was called before his local board No. 21, Detroit, physically examined, and passed. No claim of exemption was made to the local board, but within five days he claimed exemption to the district board. He asserted he was an industrial necessity in his father's factory, which would suffer material loss if he was separated from it. Among supporting affidavits is that of Henry Ford, his father, who averred it would be a substantial and material loss to remove his son Edsel from the pay roll. Only a short time before this Ford had testified in the suit of Dodge against Ford that not a single man in his entire industry was necessary to him, so perfect was his system of organization.

Edsel Ford was about 23 years old at that time. His experience was limited, and it did not appear in detail what the character of his work performed was. It appeared the company was wonderfully organized with a variety of executives, experts in their respective lines. It was the largest individual industry in the district, numbering many large enterprises. Yet Edsel Ford

was the only man in the entire district claiming occupational exemption, alleging he was necessary to the successful operation of the business. The quota of the district was 12,539 men. When the board decided the case it had actually certified to The Adjutant General for service 11,080 men. This had required an examination by the local boards of the district of about 70,000 registrants. The district board unanimously denied his discharge from military service. The board was composed of three Democrats and two Republicans, all men of wide experience in practical affairs. They say:

It is unthinkable that this young man, 23 years of age, should be the only one of his class in this entire examination.

It is further observed by the board:

It is a matter of general knowledge that Mr. Ford got along in business surprisingly well for a long period of time without any help from his son. We have no doubt but that during this critical period in our country's progress he will find a way to continue to do so.

The board adds:

To say that the loss of service to the Ford Motor Car Co., with their wonderful organization, of this young man would result in a direct substantial material loss to the company is obviously absurd. To allow this claim would not only fail to maintain the national interest, but would seriously, adversely, affect the national interest during the present emergency. We can think of no one thing that would more deservedly subject the selective draft to serious criticism and the imputation of special favoritism than to allow the claim for exemption herein urged.

From this unanimous decision of the district board Edsel Ford appealed to the President for exemption from military service into which thousands of his fellow countrymen had been drafted. He asked for a stay of drafting into the service pending the appeal, which was granted, and all papers were promptly forwarded to the President, who kept them September, October, November, and part of December, 1917. On December 15, 1917, the Revised Selective Service Regulations, Form 999, became effective. The records of the district board No. 1, of Detroit, will show several hundred appeals were made to the President, and most of them were decided before the revised regulations were promulgated, leaving Edsel Ford's appeal the only one on the President's table. An order was simultaneously issued that no undecided cases pending on presidential appeal should be returned to the boards and any registrant affected by the appeal should have come under the new system with its benefits and advantages. It is generally believed that Henry Ford made a direct application to the President in Edsel's appeal, and as a result Gen. Crowder was, much against his own choice, required by the President so to form the new regulations as to create a class into which Edsel Ford could fall and be exempted without arousing too much attention or comment.

Note class 2-a of the new regulations:

Married men with children, or father of motherless children, where such wife or children or such motherless children are not mainly dependent on his labor for support, for reason that there are other reasonable certain sources of adequate support excluding earnings or possible earnings from labor of wife available and that the removal of registrant will not deprive such dependents of support.

An examination of such rule shows it does not comply with the act of May 18, 1917, or the Provost Marshal General, as first interpreted and applied to him. The law permitted the President to exempt only those in a "status with respect to persons dependent on them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable."

The words in the new regulations "mainly dependent for support" in class 2-a is a palpable invasion of the law, because class 1 furnished 2,800,000 men and was constantly increased by new registrants. It was most likely that class 2-a would never be reached. The rank favoritism, however, under class 2-a and the definition in the Selective Service Regulations, second edition, page 46, is apparent. I quote:

Registrants may claim and may be entitled to deferred classification, class 2a * * * although wife or children are not mainly dependent upon his labor for support.

A grosser perversion and abuse of Executive power or nullification of an act of Congress can not be cited.

The draft boards and the public voiced a tremendous protest against such an arbitrary, unjust rule. Many draft boards refused to classify anybody under it. It was known all over Michigan and elsewhere as the Edsel class. Young Ford, on the creation of class 2-a, immediately claimed exemption under it. The local board denied it in spite of the new rule. He appealed to the district board, which exempted him by a vote of 3 to 2.

The effect on the draft was so disastrous in Michigan that the Government ordered two investigations, and the President tendered, while one of them was pending, a commission to Edsel Ford, which he refused. Neither as an officer or a private was he willing to serve his country. He had a wife and one child, and was exempted under the second regulations,

while other married men with children or whose cases had been decided had gone to war or were waiting to go to war under the first regulations. These men had the law changed arbitrarily in plain view by the President to exempt Edsel Ford, while under the first ruling they were drafted. The new or second rule was not applied so those who had not gone to camps but who had failed to appeal to the President would have the benefit of it. A protest went up against this discrimination that made even the hardened departmental officers wince. It explains why the Secretary of War refused to let the public records of the case be seen by a Member of Congress. They can not stand daylight.

Why was Edsel Ford's case held up by the President for months? There was nothing complicated about it. A young man 23 years old claimed he was indispensable to an industry. His father was of enormous wealth and head of what he had sworn was so perfect a corporate organization that nobody's death or withdrawal would affect it. Both the local and district boards had unanimously refused to exempt him. The long delay was to contrive a rule that would release him from service. It took time to invent something that would send many thousands to war and exempt a wealthy protégé of Executive favor.

The appeal ought to have been immediately decided and returned, so drafted men would know Edsel Ford was an example to show that all were treated alike and the draft law was what it was intended to be, a common rule for all instead of a house of refuge built by special regulations to except a wealthy scion of a wealthy father. It was demonstrated that the decision was delayed and young Ford escaped with no actual dependency on him of any kind under any rules or laws. Until this special exemption was framed for Ford, the act itself and every rule promulgated by Gen. Crowder made actual dependency the sole and only test.

Hundreds of thousands were conscripted under the first regulations and the Army was practically raised under rules from which Edsel Ford was at last removed by long delay and a special rule devised by the President palpably for no other purpose.

It was regarded as so gross an exhibition of favoritism that registrants in Michigan did not hesitate to claim the benefit of class 2-a. In other States draft boards did not take the new rule seriously and registrants were ashamed to avail themselves of it. This is demonstrated by the following statement:

In Michigan there were 411,000 registrants and 84,601 in class 2-a.

That shows that the indignation in Michigan was pronounced and widespread.

In Alabama there were 206,248 registrants and 20,850 in class 2-a.

In New York there were 1,120,332 registrants and 74,715 in class 2-a.

In Pennsylvania there were 902,996 registrants and 79,794 in class 2-a.

In Ohio there were 617,371 registrants and 47,467 in class 2-a.

In California there were 332,593 registrants and 13,177 in class 2-a.

In Massachusetts there were 398,364 registrants and 31,330 in class 2-a.

In Wisconsin there were 266,691 registrants and 24,392 in class 2-a.

Comment on such a rule is needless when New York with 1,120,332 registrants, nearly three times Michigan's, had only 74,715 men, 10,000 fewer than Michigan, claim exemption under the Edsel Ford rule made expressly for him by the President.

We can now understand why Ford, the father, became a candidate for the United States Senate in Michigan because the President asked him to. It explains why the Secretary of War protects both the Fords by refusing the right to examine the public records in the case. What a democracy of military service it is! The Secretary does well to suppress the public records of his Chief's and his own evasion of law and shameless abuse of power.

I have a statement and some quotations that I wish to insert without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A STATEMENT ON A NATIONAL WAR SCANDAL.

"On June 5, 1917, 368,064 men registered in Michigan for a military service. Among them was Edsel Ford, son of Henry Ford, late a candidate for Senator in that State and now a contestant in this body. Of these registrants 135,341 were accepted for service. Of those accepted 44,516 went to camp and abroad

before November 15, 1917, when the President promulgated the new regulation and when Edsel Ford's appeal was returned by the President without action. Of these 44,516 named accepted for service from the State of Michigan under the first regulations of the draft law 6,840 were married men, as it appears from the report of the Provost Marshal General.

"Edsel Ford was a registrant of local board 21, Detroit, which under the first draft regulation had a registration of 2,449. Four hundred and forty-eight were accepted physically. After the June 5, 1917, regulation under the selective-service law of May 18, 1917, regulations were promulgated June 30, 1917, by the Secretary of War, known as the Rules and Regulations, Form 13.

"The act authorized, under section 4 of the law of May 18, 1917, the President to exempt persons engaged in industry, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of national interests during the emergency, and those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable, and those found to be physically or morally deficient. The foregoing act used only the word 'exemption,' and it is to be noted only authorized the President through the machinery of the draft boards which he was to create under the act, and the regulations which he was to promulgate for their guidance under the act to exempt on the ground of dependency 'those in a status with respect to persons dependent on them for support, which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable.' It will be seen later that the promulgation of the second regulation was an avoidance of the words in the act 'persons dependent on them for support.'

"Under the first regulation promulgated by the President to govern the registrants of June 5, 1917, Form 13, the system was, in brief, that local and district boards were created in each State. The local boards had exclusive jurisdiction over the dependency and certain other claims for exemption made by the registrants and had complete control of the physical examination, mobilization, and entrainment of the men. The district boards had appellate jurisdiction of the appeal of the man if held for service, and upon the Government's appeal is exempted over all registrants. Such boards had exclusive jurisdiction of claims made on industrial or agricultural grounds. Under these first regulations all men were first examined by their local boards, and then on very informal, brief, and easily understood blanks made their claims before the local board if they desired. If they passed their physical examination and had no claims within the jurisdiction of the local board, such as dependency, they filed their claim for industrial or agricultural exemption with the district board. This claim consisted of a small blank to be filed with the district board, setting forth their claims and supported by as many affidavits as they cared to procure in support thereof. The district board then passed upon the same, and if the registrant was not satisfied, he could within seven days appeal to the President. It then became the duty of the district board to certify the entire record in respect to such claim to the President, who might affirm, modify, or reverse the decision.

"The first regulations provided, as to dependency, as follows: 'Any married man whose wife or child is dependent upon his labor for support' might be exempted upon the showing that the income from which the wife or child received their support was mainly derived from property or other sources independent of his mental or physical labor. Exemptions were only provided for 'those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, which renders their exclusion or discharge desirable.'

"The man and his wife had to make a very full showing as to the income of each of them and of each child, and of any sums contributed to them and from what the sums were derived. The regulations provided that the term 'labor,' as used in the regulations, meant the fruit of mental or physical effort and not income derived from property or other sources independent of mental or physical labor.

"After the promulgation of these regulations a number of rulings were handed down by the Provost Marshal General, principal among which was the 'ready, willing, and able' regulation, which is said to have been procured directly from the President, and which, in brief, was that if either the registrant's relatives, or his wife's relatives, or his children's relatives were ready, willing, and able to support his wife and children in the husband's absence, then no case of dependency was made out. This situation is referred to in the first report of the Provost Marshal General, after the first draft was through, published December 20, 1917. In this report, at page 22, Gen. Crowder says:

"The most difficult problem of selecting for the local boards was raised by the question of dependency, and especially in its relation to married men of draftable age. There has been some very significant debate in the Senate on consideration of the bill as to whether married men should be exempted from the first draft as such, or whether the determinative principle should be dependency, as it had been agreed that it should be in all other relationships. An amendment exempting married men as such was rejected by the Senate on the direct issue that there was no equity in excusing a married man and necessarily sending a single man to the battle front in his place, when no condition of dependency of the wife existed in fact. There is much to be said on both sides of this question, but it was for this office to execute the law and not to debate it.

"It is significant that on December 20, 1917, Gen. Crowder saw fit to abide by the sentiment of the Senate and to execute the law and not to debate it, by not exempting married people merely because they were married. But, by the time he promulgated his second regulations, he had a change of heart and succeeded in defeating the Senate by—instead of using the word 'exemption,' as used in the act—using the word 'deferment,' and creating five classes, knowing, however, that classes 2 and 3 and 5 were tantamount to exemption. To show that he did know this we have but to refer to the report of December 20, 1917, where, in large type, at page 35, in speaking of the creation of the new system, he says:

"No human mind can forecast the resultant numbers in class 1, but (as the roughest guess, based on the experiences of the first draft) it is estimated that class 1 will comprise a list of physically acceptable men, in number close to 1,000,000—enough for any call in present prospect. Whether this guess be justified in practice or not, it can be announced now as the policy and belief of this office and in all probability it will be possible to fill our military needs without ever invading any class more deferred than class 1; and this is the promise, the standard, and the goal, here for the first time announced, toward which every administrative effort of this office shall be directed.

"Gen. Crowder, in his second report, issued December 20, 1918, after the close of the war, at page 2, quotes this standard and goal set by his office, and says:

"The promise has been fulfilled. Our fighting forces were supplied with men from class 1 only. From the ordinary walks of civil life 2,810,296 men were drawn and placed in the military service. But the deferred classes have remained intact. When hostilities closed there remained in class 1 a supply of fighting men sufficient to meet every military necessity.

"And if the course of the second draft, after the creation of the five classes, be followed, it will be seen what efforts were made by Gen. Crowder to keep class 1 filled, so as not to invade the other classes. He did this by the creation of the 'work or fight' and other orders. In the first report Gen. Crowder, after making his remark that he was to execute the law and not debate it, continues:

"It may not be amiss to remark, however, that the net result of the provision was to extract from the field of persons who had no claim of exemption other than the fact that they were married 163,115. And of the 1,294,830 persons discharged on all possible grounds of exemption, 748,762, or 58 per cent, were discharged on the ground of dependency accruing from marriage. There were 1,500,056 married persons called, and only 163,115, or less than 11 per cent chosen.

"The question of actual dependency was left to the boards to determine. It can hardly be said that local boards composed of the neighbors of men to be taken for military service were not the best conceivable tribunals to weigh these questions of dependency, or that they could not be relied upon both to protect the Government from the insistence of selfish and thoughtless claimants on the one hand, and to treat each case of substantial merit with intelligence and sympathetic consideration on the other. In by far the majority of boards this result was attained, but in a very few instances such an uncompromising view of the regulations and the rulings issued in aid thereof was taken that some married men were selected, leaving wives and even children in distress.

"It must be recognized that there were very great difficulties in deciding individual cases.

"Very early in the execution of the law the specific question was put to this office: 'Where the parents of the registrant, or his wife, or both, are ready, able, and willing to undertake the support of the wife during the absence of the registrant can the wife be considered as mainly dependent on the labor of the registrant for support?' It is an extremely dangerous thing to attempt to guide the discretion of so large a collection of tribunals. At the time this question was propounded reports from the various governors were rather alarming, since it was stated that over 70 per cent of registrants were claiming exemption on the ground of dependency. A considerable class of cases had been brought to the attention of this office in which men who had never really supported their wives, but who were, in fact, dependent on their own parents or the parents of their wives, were claiming exemption on the ground that their wives were 'mainly dependent on their daily labor for support.'

"On August 8, therefore, a ruling was made that in that class of cases where the registrant, as a matter of fact was not dependent upon himself, and the parents of the registrant or of his wife were ready, able, and willing to undertake the support of the wife during the absence of the husband, the boards would be justified in finding that such a registrant had not a good claim for exemption on the ground of the dependency of his wife.

"This ruling did not work well. The few boards that had been prone to hold married men for service in the absence of the most unequivocal circumstance of dependency took the ruling as authority to look into the material wealth of the parents of the husband or of the wife. Regardless of readiness and willingness, regardless of whether or not the wife had in the past been actually dependent on the labor of the husband for support, these boards held some married men for service wherever it appeared to them that, rather than let the wife

suffer, the parents would undertake her support during the absence of the husband.

"As soon as this condition developed attention of the boards was called to the error on August 27, and the district boards were cautioned to scan cases before them on appeal to correct such errors. On September 27 local boards were instructed to reopen and reconsider cases in which such erroneous action had been taken, even though the registrant might have been inducted into military service in the meantime.

"It will be noted that at the very time Gen. Crowder wrote the above, the appeal of Edsel Ford was nominally on the President's desk and actually in Gen. Crowder's office, probably on Col. Warren's desk; and that he nowhere in this report refers to the cases of married men with or without children possessed of ample means themselves to support their dependents in their absence, or whose wives were possessed of the same means. In Edsel Ford's case both parties, husband and wife, were possessed of ample, independent means.

"In Gen. Crowder's second report, in speaking of the situation under the first draft regulations, he refers to the fact that class I was constantly being replenished by the new registrants arriving at age, and by men giving up exemptions granted to them and by other means.

"In the second report Gen. Crowder made after the war he takes up the subject of dependency at page 108, and speaks of the rulings during 1917, under which Edsel Ford first came, and under which he should have been sent to war. He speaks of the case of the wife able to obtain support from her own labor or from the assistance of relatives of herself or her husband. He says that August 8, 1917, he issued a ruling that no dependency should be deemed to exist in the following cases:

"1. Where the parents or other relatives of the wife or the husband are able, ready, and willing to provide adequate support for her (and children, if any) during the absence of the husband.

"2. Where the wife owns land which has produced income by the husband's labor, but which could, with reasonable certainty, be rented during his absence to other persons so as to produce an adequate support.

"3. Where there exists some arrangement by which the salary or wage of the husband is continued, in whole or in part, by third persons, being employers or insurers or others, and such portion of the salary or wage, either alone or with an allotment of his soldier's pay, or with other definite income, will furnish a reasonably adequate support.

"Gen. Crowder continues:

"The matter having been presented to the President, the following were his orders thereon:

"We ought as far as practicable to raise this new National Army without creating the hardships necessarily entailed when the head of the family is taken, and I hope for the most part those accepted in the first call would be found to be men who had not yet assumed such relations. The selective service law makes the fact of dependence, rather than the fact of marriage, the basis for exemption, and there are undoubtedly many cases within the age limits fixed by law, of men who are married and yet whose accumulations or other economic surroundings are such that no dependency of the wife exists in fact. Plainly, the law does not contemplate exemption for this class of men. The regulations promulgated on June 20, 1917, should be regarded as controlling these cases, and the orders issued under that regulation directing exemption boards to establish the fact of dependents in addition to the fact of marriage ought not to be abrogated.

"Accordingly, the following ruling was announced: (Compiled Rulings, P. M. G. O., No. 10, par. 1, Aug. 27) Dependency—Other sources of support.—Paragraph B, Compiled Rulings of this office, No. 6, addressed a state of affairs where the parents or other relatives of the wife or husband are able, ready, and willing adequately to support the wife and children, if any, during the absence of the husband. This ruling was responsive to a class of cases that had been brought to the attention of this office where claims of discharge had been made on the ground of dependency on a husband who, as a matter of fact, was not dependent upon himself. The ruling directed the attention of local boards to the fact that scrutiny of cases of this kind might disclose that no discharge was advisable. It was not intended in paragraph B, Compiled Rulings No. 6, should apply to the case of a head of a family whose family at the time of his summons and prior thereto were and had been mainly dependent upon his labor for support. At the same time for the specific case of a wife able to earn a livelihood by her own skill it was announced that 'where the wife and children were actually dependent on the applicant's labor for support and where there are no other means of support, the wife should not be put to the necessity of going to work to support herself'; and that such claims should therefore be recognized 'where in his absence they will be left without reasonably adequate support, after duly taking into consideration the soldier's wage and support from relatives partially or totally previously extended to the applicant himself.'

"It was thus apparent that though the principle of dependency as distinguished from marriage alone was the fundamental characteristic of the law and the regulations, yet its application developed a number of well-defined intermediary cases of varying degrees of equity, upon which the local boards could not be expected to deal with uniformity to general satisfaction. The first system of selection, therefore, while well adapted to cases where the presence or the absence of dependency was unmistakable, was found to lack sufficient flexibility to cover satisfactorily the great mass of intermediary cases.

"Gen. Crowder then, at page 111, justifies the creation of class 2-a. This concludes the remarks on the first system of the draft, and we resume the discussion of Edsel Ford's particular case under it. In August, 1917, Edsel Ford was called before local board No. 21, Detroit, physically examined, and passed. He made no claim to the local board, but within five days filed a claim with the district board, claiming to be a

necessary employee in a necessary industry which would suffer substantially and materially loss and detriment if he was taken from it. This affidavit had a number of supporting affidavits, including that of his father, Henry Ford. The affidavit of the latter was palpably false, as he had testified a short time before in the case of Dodge against Ford pending in the Wayne Circuit Court that not a single man in his entire industry was necessary to him, such was the perfection of his system. This claim came up before the district board in Detroit, being district board No. 1, of Michigan, composed of Hon. James O. Murfin, a former circuit judge of the State, a regent of the University of Michigan, and a well-known lawyer; the Hon. Frank H. Croul, former police commissioner of the city and a prominent merchant and manufacturer; Henry B. Ledyard, Esq., a prominent lawyer; the Hon. James B. Cunningham, a prominent Democratic politician and former labor commissioner of the State; and a Dr. Trizsky. Croul and Murfin were Republicans and the other three Democrats. This board unanimously denied Ford's claim by exemption and rendered, in part, the following opinion:

"The character of this application for an occupational exemption makes it seem desirable to file in this case a formal opinion in order that it may be used as a guide to the public and ourselves for future action.

"Edsel Ford is 23 years of age and only son of Henry Ford, the founder and present guiding spirit of the Ford Motor Car Co. While the claim is not supported by any showing from the chief executive of the company, there are supporting affidavits before us filed in support of this claim by subordinate officers.

"It appears from these affidavits that the applicant is a director, vice president, secretary, and treasurer of the recently organized corporation known as Henry Ford & Son. For two years he has been director, vice president, and secretary of the Ford Motor Car Co. There is no serious claim made that any substantial part of his activities are at the present time devoted to Henry Ford & Son. The exact nature of his duties with the Ford Motor Car Co. does not appear in detail, nor is there before us any definite statement of the character of the work he has been in the habit of performing. Running through the record, however (and this is substantiated by statements made to the board), it appears that primarily and principally this young man is being used in the business to relieve his father of some responsibility and do some of his father's work when Mr. Henry Ford is otherwise engaged.

"Is the given individual necessary to the industry? Our instructions from the President in connection with this phase of the case reads as follows:

"The evidence must also establish, even if the particular industrial enterprise . . . is found necessary . . . that the continuance of such person therein is necessary to the maintenance thereof, and that he can not be replaced by another person without direct, substantial, material loss and detriment to the adequate and effective operation of the particular industrial enterprise . . . in which he is engaged."

"In the light of these instructions, the determination of this last question becomes quite simple. It is not an exaggeration to state that the fame and reputation of the Ford Motor Car Co. organization is little short of marvelous, and its demonstrated efficiency is known the world over. The extraordinary achievements of this company would have been impossible but for the wonderful organization built up, in which the executives take and should take a very proper pride. It is a most significant fact that this industry, far and away the largest individual industry within our district, should have, at the time this claim for an occupational exemption was filed, but one man of draft age claimed to be necessary to its successful operation. The quota on the present call for our district is 12,539 men. More than this number have already been certified to our board by the various locals within our jurisdiction, and at the time this case was considered we had actually certified to The Adjutant General for service 11,080 men. This had involved an examination by the local boards of approximately 70,000 men. It is unthinkable that this young man, 23 years of age, should be the only one of his class in this entire examination.

"There can be no doubt that it is at all times commendable for any son to gradually prepare himself to help his father, but for us to excuse this young man from military service we must find under our regulations that he is necessary to this industry. It is a matter of general knowledge that Mr. Henry Ford got along in business surprisingly well for a long period of time without any help from his son. We have no doubt but that during this critical period in our country's progress he will find a way without much inconvenience to continue to do so.

"The primary object of the occupational exemption clause of the Selective Draft Act is to exempt from military service trained and skilled artisans whose work can not be duplicated by men over the draft age. It is not contemplated that bookkeepers, cashiers, and men of that description should be in the exempt class, and only in certain cases can an executive officer be said to be of the exempt class. Such cases do arise and will arise in the future but they are rare and exceptional in their nature. To say that the loss of service to the Ford Motor Car Co., with their wonderful organization, of this young man would result in a direct, substantial, material loss to the Ford Motor Car Co. is obviously absurd.

"It is a matter of common knowledge that Mr. James H. Cousins, a business man of ripened and matured experience, who had grown up with this business from its infancy, severed his connection abruptly but without an apparent direct, substantial, and material loss. If the organization is so perfect as not to feel the loss of a man of his character and description, how can we possibly find that there would be the loss contemplated by the statute if the applicant herein severed his connection with the company?

"No definition has yet been given by any district board or The Adjutant General of the phrase in the law reading, 'The maintenance of national interest during the emergency,' but, in our opinion, there is here presented a case when the national interest during the present emergency would be very seriously affected if a claim would not only fail to maintain the national interest but, in our judgment, would seriously adversely affect the national interest during the present emer-

agency. We can think of no one thing that would more deservedly subject the selective draft to serious criticism and the imputation of special favoritism than to allow the claim for exemption herein urged.

"Because of these reasons we reached the conclusion that the application for a discharge from military service would have to be denied."

"DISTRICT BOARD, DIVISION No. 1,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN."

"Edsel Ford then appealed to the President and asked for a stay of induction pending the appeal, which was granted; and the papers were then promptly forwarded to the President and remained with the President September, October, November, and were not returned till December, without action, when the President promulgated his new rules and regulations, with five classes; and Gen. Crowder simultaneously issued an order that no undecided cases on presidential appeal should be returned to the boards, and the registrants come under the new system, with its benefits and advantages.

"Revised Regulation, Form 999, known as the Selective Service Regulations, or S. S. R., became effective December 15. The records of district board No. 1 of Detroit will show that several hundred appeals were made to the President, and most of them, subsequent to the appeal of Edsel Ford, but all of them were decided before the new regulations went in, and it is said that Edsel Ford's appeal was the only one remaining upon the President's desk.

"Before going into the new regulations, which, in my opinion, were not justified by the act of May 18, 1917, it may be said here that it is generally rumored that direct appeal to the President was made in Edsel Ford's case after the case had been formally appealed, and that, as the result, he called in Gen. Crowder and wrote a certain personal letter to Gen. Crowder, and that the new regulations were formed and designed to take care of Edsel Ford's case by creating a class into which he could fall without too much comment. It is well known that Gen. Crowder, to various draft officers throughout the country, and to prominent citizens, stated that the creation of this new class for Edsel Ford was not of his own choice.

"The new regulations created five classes, of which class 1 was to be the class in which all men available for service were to be placed. Class 5 was to be deemed permanently exempt; and classes 2, 3, and 4 temporarily exempt (page 1, S. S. R., Form 999). The only class we are concerned with is class 2-a. This class reads:

"Married man with children, or father of motherless children, where such wife or children, or such motherless children, are not mainly dependent on his labor for support, for reason that there are other reasonably certain sources of adequate support, excluding earnings or possible earnings from labor of wife, available, and that the removal of registrant will not deprive such dependents of support.

"Class B was for a married man without children, whose wife either had worked for her support or had a profession or trade to which she could readily return with an opening to support herself.

"A most casual examination of class 2-a will disclose at once the fact that the class does not comply with the wording of the act, or Gen. Crowder's understanding of it, as explained by him in his first report. The wording of the act only permitted the President to exempt 'those in a status with respect to persons dependent on them for support, which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable.'

"As the words in the act were 'dependent upon them for support,' the words in class 2-a are 'mainly dependent for support,' and, in addition, these persons put in 2-a were exempted even though the word 'deferred' was chosen, because class 1 provided 2,800,000 men, and was constantly replenished by new registrants, the work or fight rule, the changing of occupations of men, and the removal of dependents for various causes, and by the constant shifting of the other classes by the boards. In fact, with over 4,000,000 men under arms in war, and not all of class 1 used at its close, with 2,000,000 infantrymen in France, it is highly improbable that the Army could accommodate more than the normal refilling of class 1.

"But the greatest injustice in the eyes of the draft boards was that class 2-a could only, under its wording and under the definition in the second edition S. S. R., Form 999-a, take care of men who themselves, or their wives, were of independent means. In other words, it only provided for a rich man.

"At page 46, S. S. R. second edition, 999-a, class 2-a was defined, and it reads:

"Registrants may claim and may be entitled to deferred classification, class 2, divisions a and b, although wife or children are not mainly dependent on his labor for support.

"This very definition, taken in connection with the circumstances of the case, is a clear evasion of the act of May 18, 1917, and of the Senate's refusal to permit the mere status to itself exempt any registrant.

"The practical effect of this creation of class 2-a was a storm of protest to Gen. Crowder from the draft boards and other

persons, and criticism was universal. Many of the draft boards throughout the country refused to classify anybody in it.

"Edsel Ford, immediately on the creation of class 2-a, made a claim to come under it. The claim was denied at once by his local board, despite the law, and he appealed to the district board. The district board, by a vote of 3 to 2, despite the law, granted him the exemption. The three voting on the law, despite their opinions, and the two not caring whether the law was there or not.

"After Edsel's exemption was granted, the class became known in Michigan and elsewhere as the Edsel class instead of 2-a, and the effect was so disastrous upon the draft in Michigan, everybody feeling that they were entitled to get out who were in circumstances like Edsel, that the Government twice ordered an investigation of the Edsel case. One of the investigations came from the Department of the Lakes at Chicago, and finally Adj. Gen. Bersey and Maj. Peterman, his assistant, ordered an investigation to take place in Detroit. Communications concerning Edsel's case were sent to Robert K. Davis and to the district board in Detroit for investigation. While this investigation was pending, Edsel was tendered a commission by the President, and declined it.

"Gen. Crowder, at page 111 of his second report, seeks to justify the creation of class 2-a, where he says that the phrase 'not mainly dependent' included the case of a married man with a wife and children, 'where there was in fact no dependency whatever other than the natural responsibility which attaches to the status of the normal husband and father.'

"It appears to me, in his words Gen. Crowder convicts himself of an evasion of the Senate's refusal to make the status one of exemption in itself, but there is no doubt existing in the minds of those who know Gen. Crowder that he did this under orders.

"It should be remembered in this entire discussion that class 4-a provided for a man whose wife or children are mainly dependent upon his labor for support.

"Edsel Ford had one child and came under 2-a.

"It must be kept clear in a discussion of this kind that 2-a and 3-b are district; that 2-b only raises the question of a married man who, if taken, his wife would have to go to work for her living. None of the boards believed in sending a wife to work for a living. Therefore Gen. Crowder's discussion, at page 114, of where he sent out queries to the boards asking them what they thought of 2-a and b should be disregarded, as their replies lump these two classes together.

"In the discussion the grave injustice done to other married men with children, who had gone to war under the first regulations, or whose cases had been decided under the first regulations, and who were waiting to go to war, will be seen, as this was changed under their very noses while they were in this country. The benefit of this new law, to wit, that a married man with a child, with independent means, should be put in class 2, was not applied in such manner that those who had gone to camps, but who had failed to appeal to the President, would be given the advantage of it; or that those in camps who had failed to appeal to the President could be released, and a storm of protest went up from these men of means, that Edsel Ford should not have the same law applied to him as was applied to them. The figures can be gotten with great exactitude from the tables heretofore quoted, and also given in Crowder's first and second reports.

"The first query that occurs in the discussion above is, why was Edsel's appeal held up? What serious question was in it that it needed to be held up? It was the clearest case that any district board has sent to the President on appeal. This man, of 22 years, traveling south and elsewhere for over six months of each year, with practically no responsibility in the Ford Co. factory, having been connected most of the time with his father in the tractor plant, and with the evidence and opinion of the district board, presented no difficulties on appeal. The appeal should have been promptly sent back so that a great example could have been given to the draft registrants that Edsel Ford could neither delay the decision of his appeal nor get out by any other means.

"The second query presented is why should class 2-a ever have been created? In view of the wording of the act of May 18, 1917, and the fact that the Senate had refused to consider marriage in itself as a cause of exemption, and in the fact that all through the new and the old regulations, and all through every special ruling handed down by Gen. Crowder the fact was kept prominent before all boards that dependency alone was the sole and only test of exemption or deferment.

"I have not the numerous rulings handed down under the first draft before me, as they are not available, but if an investigation is ever held on this question Gen. Crowder's and the President's arguments and ruling during the first draft, as is-

sued in the bulletins by Gen. Crowder, should be looked up on this very question of dependency.

"Under the first draft the sole question was whether a wife and children were or were not dependent upon the husband's labor for support. It was clear from the beginning in the first draft that if a husband or wife had independent means he could not be exempted. But under the first draft the Government even went further, and under the President's express and personal ruling, written, as Gen. Crowder has stated, on his own typewriter, he went so far as to state that even if the relatives of the husband or wife were ready, willing, and able to care for the dependents while the man went to war, then in fact there was no dependency.

"In conclusion I call attention merely to the effect in Michigan of Edsel Ford's exemption. In Appendix, Table 62-a, page 449, second report of Gen. Crowder to the Secretary of War, we find a table of the registration in all the States given and the number placed in class 2. I merely quote a very few States to show how the draft boards in Michigan felt, that if Edsel was given the benefit of class 2, all others should be given it, and the fact that registrants were not ashamed to claim class 2 when they found that Edsel was put in it. In other States draft boards did not regard class 2-a seriously, and registrants were ashamed to claim the Edsel class.

"In Alabama there were 206,248 registrants, and 20,850 were in class 2.

"In Michigan there were 411,000 registrants, and 84,601 in class 2.

"In New York there were 1,120,332 registrants, and 74,715 in class 2, or 10,000 less than Michigan, with practically three times the registration.

"In Pennsylvania there were 902,996 registrants, and 79,794 in class 2.

"In Wisconsin 266,691 registrants, and 24,392 in class 2.

"In Ohio 617,371 registrants, and 47,467 in class 2.

"In California 332,593 registrants, and 13,177 in class 2.

"Massachusetts, 398,364 registrants, or practically that of Michigan, and 31,330 in class 2.

"Appendix at page 401 should also be examined into."

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, July 17, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 15, 1919.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Robert P. Stewart to be Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Edward C. Knotts to be United States attorney, southern district of Illinois.

Edwin S. Wertz to be United States attorney, northern district of Ohio.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

John Hugh Kirkpatrick to be United States marshal, western district of Louisiana.

John J. Mitchell to be United States marshal, district of Massachusetts.

Thomas Pickett to be United States marshal, district of Nevada.

Michael Devaney to be United States marshal, southern district of Ohio.

William R. Bennett to be United States marshal, district of Porto Rico.

U. S. EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

John J. Keegan to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank F. Steele, at Helena, Mont.

Raymundo Harrison, at Fort Sumner, N. Mex.

William G. Cowan, at Roswell, N. Mex.

Matthias N. Fegty, at Vale, Oreg.

Heber C. Jex, at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Claude E. Rusk, at Yakima, Wash.

William F. Page, at Spokane, Wash.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

George R. Rogers to be second lieutenant.

INFANTRY.

Cadet Julius Lynch Piland to be second lieutenant.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

First Lieut. Earl Hazelton Hare.

First Lieut. Robert Effinger Cumming.

First Lieut. Thomas Matthew Calladine, jr.

First Lieut. William Davis Gill.

First Lieut. Harvey David Thornburg.

First Lieut. Charles Smith Moss.

First Lieut. Irwin Bradfield Smock.

First Lieut. James Kerr Anderson.

Maj. John Newton Merrick.

Maj. Everett Allen Anderson.

Maj. George Newlove.

Lieut. Col. Luke Baker Peck.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Morrow to be colonel.

Maj. James J. Mayes to be lieutenant colonel.

Lieut. Col. Walter A. Bethel to be judge advocate with the rank of colonel.

Maj. Irvin L. Hunt to be judge advocate with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Clarence C. Williams.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Hof.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Maj. Lewis H. Rand to be lieutenant colonel.

To be majors.

Capt. Clarence L. Sturdevant.

Capt. Earl J. Atkisson.

Capt. Richard T. Colner.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Llewellyn B. Griffith to be captain.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. William Chamberlaine.

Lieut. Col. Gordon G. Heiner.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas E. Merrill to be colonel.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Edward T. Donnelly.

Maj. George M. Brooke.

To be majors.

Capt. Charles J. Ferris.

Capt. William Bryden.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Theodore W. Wrenn.

First Lieut. Harold W. Rehm.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Lawrence J. Fleming.

Lieut. Col. Oren B. Meyer.

Lieut. Col. Charles J. Symmonds.

Lieut. Col. Edward D. Anderson.

Lieut. Col. George P. White.

To be majors.

Capt. Walter S. Grant.

Capt. Charles M. Wesson.

Capt. Morton C. Mumma.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Ion C. Holm.

First Lieut. Robert C. Candee.

First Lieut. Joseph L. Phillips.

First Lieut. Kenneth McCatty.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Geer.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Paul A. Wolf.
 Lieut. Col. George D. Moore.
 Lieut. Col. Willis Uline.
 Lieut. Col. Charles C. Clark.
 Lieut. Col. Vernon A. Caldwell.
 Lieut. Col. Edmund L. Butts.
 Lieut. Col. Henry J. Hunt.
 Lieut. Col. Truman O. Murphy.
 Lieut. Col. Ross L. Bush.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Hugh D. Wise.
 Maj. Pegram Whitworth.
 Maj. James A. Moss.
 Maj. Ulysses G. Worrlow.
 Maj. Frank J. Morrow.
 Maj. Henry C. Clement, jr.

To be majors.

Capt. Alvin C. Voris.
 Capt. Fred L. Davidson.
 Capt. George E. Kumpe.
 Capt. Milo C. Corey.
 Capt. Arthur M. Ferguson.
 Capt. De Witt W. Chamberlin.
 Capt. Walter H. Johnson.
 Capt. Robert G. Rutherford, jr.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Harvey C. Kearney.
 First Lieut. James D. Basey.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Louis T. Hess.
 Lieut. Col. Christopher C. Collins.
 Lieut. Col. Benjamin J. Edger, jr.
 Lieut. Col. Samuel M. Waterhouse.
 Lieut. Col. Eugene H. Hartnett.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Leartus J. Owen.
 Maj. Robert M. Culler.
 Maj. Frank W. Weed.
 Maj. William A. Wickline.

To be majors.

Capt. William M. Archer, jr.
 Capt. Henry F. Phillips.
 Capt. Nicholson F. Curtis.
 Capt. John S. C. Fielden, jr.
 Capt. John M. Hewitt.
 Capt. Claude W. Cummings.
 Capt. James M. Troutt.
 Capt. Alan DeF. Smith.
 Capt. Frank M. Ende.
 Capt. Samuel A. White.
 Capt. Albert W. Greenwell.
 Capt. Francis M. Fitts.
 Capt. Eric A. Fennel.
 Capt. Paul E. McNabb.
 Capt. Harvey E. Webb.
 Capt. George F. Aycock.
 Capt. Henry W. Grady.
 Capt. Philip J. Lukens, jr.
 Capt. Norman McL. Scott.
 Capt. Marion R. Mobley.
 Capt. Frederick K. Herpel.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Horace S. Villars.
 First Lieut. Allen D. Lazenby.
 First Lieut. Patrick F. McGuire.
 First Lieut. James W. McClaran.
 First Lieut. Louis F. Boyd.
 First Lieut. Tom S. Mebane.
 First Lieut. Edmund B. Spaeth.
 First Lieut. Philip L. Coulter.
 First Lieut. James B. Montgomery.
 First Lieut. Percy E. Duggins.
 First Lieut. Brown S. McClintic.
 First Lieut. Henry K. B. Hufford.
 First Lieut. Joseph G. Fernbach.
 First Lieut. Howard H. Dignan.
 First Lieut. Charles W. Sale.
 First Lieut. Robert H. Lowry, jr.

First Lieut. Hertel P. Makel.
 First Lieut. Ward S. Wells.
 First Lieut. Seymour C. Schwartz.
 First Lieut. Burgh S. Burnet.
 First Lieut. Karl F. Kesmodel.
 First Lieut. Ross Golden.
 First Lieut. Curtis D. Pillsbury.
 First Lieut. Nelson A. Myll.
 First Lieut. John R. DeVelling.
 First Lieut. Roy L. Scott.
 First Lieut. William W. Southard.
 First Lieut. George H. Dorsey.
 First Lieut. Laurent L. LaRoche.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Dooling.
 First Lieut. Frank S. Matlack.
 First Lieut. Cleon J. Gentzkow.
 First Lieut. James P. Crawford.
 First Lieut. Robert A. Hale.
 First Lieut. Allen R. Howard.
 First Lieut. Benjamin B. Rowley.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Bradford.
 First Lieut. Henry H. Towler.
 First Lieut. Oral B. Bollbaugh.
 First Lieut. Joseph R. Jones.
 First Lieut. Harold E. Clark.
 First Lieut. Roland A. Davison.
 First Lieut. Haskett L. Conner.
 First Lieut. Edward B. Macon.
 First Lieut. Percy J. Carroll.
 First Lieut. Virginus Minervini.
 First Lieut. James V. Fallis.
 First Lieut. William D. Pettit.
 First Lieut. Glenn H. Reams.
 First Lieut. Jay DeP. Mingos.
 First Lieut. Allan W. Dawson.
 First Lieut. John W. McKeever.
 First Lieut. Ottis L. Graham.
 First Lieut. Edwin H. Roberts.
 First Lieut. Arthur M. Bacon.
 First Lieut. John J. Moore.
 First Lieut. Anthony J. Vadala.
 First Lieut. Maurice S. Weaver.
 First Lieut. John M. Stanley.
 First Lieut. Arthur H. Nylan.
 First Lieut. Myron P. Rudolph.
 First Lieut. Noble DuB. McCormack.
 First Lieut. Charles E. Sima.
 First Lieut. Bascom H. Palmer.
 First Lieut. Harold D. Rogers.
 First Lieut. John R. Hall.
 First Lieut. Arthur R. Gaines.
 First Lieut. William L. Starnes.
 First Lieut. William A. Boyle.
 First Lieut. Manton L. Shelby.
 First Lieut. Paul H. Streit.
 First Lieut. John E. Robinson.
 First Lieut. Lewis E. J. Browne.
 First Lieut. Ernest K. Stratton.
 First Lieut. James A. Orbison.
 First Lieut. Paul M. N. Kyle.
 First Lieut. William C. Whitmore.
 First Lieut. Albert B. Pavy.
 First Lieut. Francis E. Evans.
 First Lieut. Charles E. Brenn.
 First Lieut. Francis T. Duffy.
 First Lieut. Leonard W. Weaver.
 First Lieut. Louie Felger.
 First Lieut. Leo S. Trask.
 First Lieut. Raymond A. Tomassene.
 First Lieut. Lowyd W. Ballantyne.
 First Lieut. Otto R. Brown.
 First Lieut. Charles E. Yoho.
 First Lieut. Cornelius A. Denehy.
 First Lieut. Joseph P. Madigan.
 First Lieut. Robert K. Simpson.
 First Lieut. Patrick S. Madigan.
 First Lieut. Frederick B. Little.
 First Lieut. Chester A. Stayton.
 First Lieut. Herbert W. Rogers.
 First Lieut. John R. Evers.
 First Lieut. Ralph E. Curti.
 First Lieut. Daniel C. Hankey.
 First Lieut. Frederick A. Blesse.
 First Lieut. Charles C. Dickey.
 First Lieut. George B. Fletcher.

First Lieut. Walter H. Mytinger.
 First Lieut. John J. Carden.
 First Lieut. Henry E. Fraser.
 First Lieut. John R. Whisenant.
 First Lieut. Harold H. Golding.
 First Lieut. Harry P. Shugerman.
 First Lieut. William C. Pollock.
 First Lieut. William W. McCaw.
 First Lieut. Edward H. Tonolla.
 First Lieut. Earle D. Quinnell.
 First Lieut. Harold O. Brown.
 First Lieut. Douglas H. Mebane.
 First Lieut. Paul B. Johnson.
 First Lieut. Irving K. Lovett.
 First Lieut. Montreville A. St. Peter.
 First Lieut. Frank McA. Moose.
 First Lieut. Percy K. Telford.
 First Lieut. Benjamin F. Pence.
 First Lieut. Wayne R. Beardsley.
 First Lieut. Warren Stirling.
 First Lieut. Don G. Hilldrup.
 First Lieut. Richard S. Magee.
 First Lieut. William A. Smith.
 First Lieut. Frank W. Pinger.
 First Lieut. Ivy A. Pelzman.
 First Lieut. Edward S. Murphy.
 First Lieut. Richard E. Werlich.
 First Lieut. Herbert R. Stolz.
 First Lieut. Louis de K. Belden.
 First Lieut. Andrew W. Smith.
 First Lieut. Willard S. Howard.
 First Lieut. Philip P. Green.
 First Lieut. William H. Barrow.
 First Lieut. Gordon F. Willey.
 First Lieut. Frank A. Plum.
 First Lieut. Charles R. Irving.
 First Lieut. William W. Jones.
 First Lieut. Charles C. Hawke.
 First Lieut. Noland M. Canter.
 First Lieut. Pierre N. Charbonnet.
 First Lieut. James C. Kimbrough.
 First Lieut. Meredith R. Johnston.
 First Lieut. Merrill K. Lindsay.
 First Lieut. William D. Middleton.
 First Lieut. Leon H. Cornwall.
 First Lieut. Read B. Harding.
 First Lieut. James W. Duckworth.
 First Lieut. Bradford Massey.
 First Lieut. Edgar H. Howell.
 First Lieut. George W. Snyder.
 First Lieut. Paul S. Wagner.
 First Lieut. John A. P. Millet.
 First Lieut. Joseph D. Foley.
 First Lieut. Lewis A. Newfield.
 First Lieut. Thomas M. Leahy.
 First Lieut. Louis A. LaGarde, jr.
 First Lieut. Edward L. Moore.
 First Lieut. William M. Archer, jr.
 First Lieut. Henry F. Phillips.
 First Lieut. Nicholson F. Curtis.
 First Lieut. John S. C. Fielden, jr.
 First Lieut. John M. Hewitt.
 First Lieut. Claude W. Cummings.
 First Lieut. James M. Troutt.
 First Lieut. Alan De F. Smith.
 First Lieut. Frank M. Ende.
 First Lieut. Samuel A. White.
 First Lieut. Albert W. Greenwell.
 First Lieut. Francis M. Fitts.
 First Lieut. Eric A. Fennel.
 First Lieut. Paul E. McNabb.
 First Lieut. Harvey E. Webb.
 First Lieut. George F. Aycock.
 First Lieut. Henry W. Grady.
 First Lieut. Philip J. Lukens, jr.
 First Lieut. Norman McL. Scott.
 First Lieut. Marion R. Mobley.
 First Lieut. Frederick K. Herpel.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Samuel J. Rohde.
 First Lieut. Leroy P. Hartley.
 First Lieut. Frederick C. Daniels.
 First Lieut. Nathan C. Pickles.

First Lieut. Robert L. Lowry.
 First Lieut. Oliver J. Christiansen.
 First Lieut. Timothy Harden.
 First Lieut. Lawrence K. Anderson.
 First Lieut. Timothy F. Leary.
 First Lieut. William C. Webb, jr.
 First Lieut. Edward C. Alley.
 First Lieut. Clinton R. Boone.
 First Lieut. David I. Edwards.
 First Lieut. Orville A. Grove.
 First Lieut. Roy M. Kisner.
 First Lieut. Edward A. Thorne.
 First Lieut. Lynn H. Tingay.
 First Lieut. Claude R. Hollister.
 First Lieut. Marhl H. Welch.
 First Lieut. Walter D. Vail.
 First Lieut. Richard K. Thompson.
 First Lieut. Leslie S. Harlan.
 First Lieut. Neil J. McCollum.
 First Lieut. Clement J. Gaynor.
 First Lieut. Walter A. Rose.
 First Lieut. Melvin R. Eiche.
 First Lieut. George Krakow.
 First Lieut. Eugene A. Smith.
 First Lieut. Jerome L. Fritzsche.
 First Lieut. Clarence J. Wright.
 First Lieut. Milton A. Price.
 First Lieut. William H. Hoblitzell.
 First Lieut. Francis M. Tench.
 First Lieut. Alvin E. Anthony.
 First Lieut. William J. R. Akeroyd.
 First Lieut. Fletcher D. Rhodes.
 First Lieut. William B. Caldwell.
 First Lieut. Lewis W. Maly.
 First Lieut. Arthur T. Burchill.
 First Lieut. Glover Johns.
 First Lieut. Frederick W. Herms.
 First Lieut. Harold J. Parker.
 First Lieut. Leslie D. Baskin.
 First Lieut. Curtis W. Hallam.
 First Lieut. James E. Dean.
 First Lieut. Henry L. Hogan.
 First Lieut. John C. Campbell.
 First Lieut. Leland S. Wilson.
 First Lieut. Benjamin H. Dean.
 First Lieut. Dell S. Gray.
 First Lieut. William B. Stewart.
 First Lieut. Julius L. Bischof.
 First Lieut. Charles H. Brammell.
 First Lieut. John A. Rowe.
 First Lieut. William T. Williams.
 First Lieut. Hooker O. Lindsey.
 First Lieut. Alvin D. Dannheiser.
 First Lieut. James R. Conner.
 First Lieut. Robert L. Strickland.
 First Lieut. Roy R. Newman.
 First Lieut. Boyd L. Smith.
 First Lieut. Avery G. Holmes.
 First Lieut. George R. Kennebeck.
 First Lieut. Alexander M. Smith, jr.
 First Lieut. Horace R. Finley.
 First Lieut. Cecil R. Hays.
 First Lieut. Roy C. Starr.
 First Lieut. Harold S. Embree.
 First Lieut. Charles L. Andrews.
 First Lieut. Byram S. Purviance.
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Boyd.
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Rahm.
 First Lieut. Clarence R. Jacobson.
 First Lieut. Norman M. Mackenzie.
 First Lieut. Richard F. Thompson.
 First Lieut. Henry H. Collins.
 First Lieut. Adrian C. Ragan.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Simon Medine.
 First Lieut. Samuel L. Kuhn.
 First Lieut. Roy M. McCutchen.
 First Lieut. William Lohmeyer, jr.
 First Lieut. William A. Clark.
 First Lieut. Aubrey H. Bond.

First Lieut. Hubert W. Collins.
First Lieut. Maurice P. Van Buren.
First Lieut. Frederick S. H. Smith.
First Lieut. Frank B. Hastie.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Paul W. Rutledge.
Second Lieut. Alvin C. Smith.
Second Lieut. James C. Corliss.
Second Lieut. Robert T. Chaplin.
Second Lieut. Chester B. McCoid.
Second Lieut. Robert G. Rhett, jr.
Second Lieut. James K. Morris.
Second Lieut. Charles E. Bates.
Second Lieut. Marshall L. Gosserand.
Second Lieut. Winthrop M. Allen.
Second Lieut. Saint John Waddell, jr.
Second Lieut. Cary B. Easley.
Second Lieut. Nicholas B. O'Connell.
Second Lieut. Oscar D. McNeely.
Second Lieut. Abraham R. Ginsburg.
Second Lieut. Vincent K. Smith.
Second Lieut. Charles L. Ordeman.
Second Lieut. Ramon Conroy.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Betts.
Second Lieut. Morris C. Handwerk.
Second Lieut. Charles Cobb, 3d.
Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Harmon.
Second Lieut. Ralph A. Densmore.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Bell, jr.
Second Lieut. Charles W. Lawrence.
Second Lieut. David W. Burgoon.
Second Lieut. Raymond B. Bottom.
Second Lieut. Farrant L. Turner.
Second Lieut. Henry T. Morrison.
Second Lieut. Leonard R. Crews.
Second Lieut. Harold M. Jobs.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Delaney.
Second Lieut. William F. Cassidy, jr.
Second Lieut. John W. Loveland, jr.
Second Lieut. Webster H. Warren.
Second Lieut. Evan H. Benoy.
Second Lieut. John B. Bethea, jr.
Second Lieut. Charles W. Higgins.
Second Lieut. Hugh N. Herrick.
Second Lieut. Harry L. Campbell.
Second Lieut. Robert Mochrie.
Second Lieut. Albert B. Ede.
Second Lieut. Donald W. Tyrrell.
Second Lieut. Everett M. Barton.
Second Lieut. Warren S. Robinson.
Second Lieut. William W. Wertz.
Second Lieut. Evans R. Crowell.
Second Lieut. Simon L. Bear.
Second Lieut. James C. Bates.
Second Lieut. William A. West, jr.
Second Lieut. Louis H. Thompson.
Second Lieut. Albert Bonds.
Second Lieut. Thomas W. Conrad.
Second Lieut. Frederick W. Hoorn.
Second Lieut. Joseph C. Stephens.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John Van H. Challiss.
Second Lieut. Junius S. Roberts.
Second Lieut. Frederic W. W. Graham, jr.
Second Lieut. Joseph R. Estabrook.
Second Lieut. Harold D. Finley.
Second Lieut. Leo J. Vogel.
Second Lieut. James P. Kelly.
Second Lieut. Richard B. von Maur.
Second Lieut. Harold T. Deeds.
Second Lieut. Millard L. Hamaker.
Second Lieut. John B. Fidler.
Second Lieut. Wilbur B. Sumner.
Second Lieut. William E. Corkill.
Second Lieut. Charles D. Brown.
Second Lieut. Lester M. Kilgarif.
Second Lieut. Henry W. Krotzer.
Second Lieut. Robert L. Randol.
Second Lieut. Douglas L. Crane.
Second Lieut. Harry N. Blue.
Second Lieut. Frederic H. Timmerman.

Second Lieut. James H. McHenry.
Second Lieut. Gurney L. Smith.
Second Lieut. John M. Franklin.
Second Lieut. George S. Goodspeed.
Second Lieut. Amos E. Carmichael.
Second Lieut. Raymond H. Seagle.
Second Lieut. John V. Anderson.
Second Lieut. Walter Rompel.
Second Lieut. Winfred C. Green.
Second Lieut. Marion I. Voorhes.
Second Lieut. Algernon S. Coleman.
Second Lieut. Robert F. La Barron.
Second Lieut. Edgar G. Crossman.
Second Lieut. James H. Boyd.
Second Lieut. Ralph K. Learnard.
Second Lieut. Pitt F. Carl, jr.
Second Lieut. David W. Potter.
Second Lieut. John H. Gardner, jr.
Second Lieut. Earl C. Ewert.
Second Lieut. Donald D. Demarest.
Second Lieut. Ralph W. Hahn.
Second Lieut. Orrin P. Kilbourn.
Second Lieut. John T. Clancy.
Second Lieut. Winthrop W. Leach.
Second Lieut. John W. O'Harrow, jr.
Second Lieut. James B. Dick.
Second Lieut. Dan C. Kenan.
Second Lieut. Joseph A. Martz.
Second Lieut. Andrew S. Messick.
Second Lieut. Lee B. Goff, jr.
Second Lieut. Kenneth S. Wallace.
Second Lieut. Ralph Heatherington.
Second Lieut. Eugene B. Ripley, jr.
Second Lieut. Thornton Davis.
Second Lieut. Frederick M. Williams.
Second Lieut. William E. Farthing.
Second Lieut. John C. Butner, jr.
Second Lieut. William B. Bowles, jr.
Second Lieut. Edward Cummings.
Second Lieut. Eugene Weston, jr.
Second Lieut. Edward S. Ott.
Second Lieut. Richard D. Roquemore.
Second Lieut. Ralph B. Bagby.
Second Lieut. Melvin L. McCreary.
Second Lieut. John S. Brown, jr.
Second Lieut. Eugene M. Re Qua.
Second Lieut. Herman H. F. Gossett.
Second Lieut. Murray M. Montgomery.
Second Lieut. Roderick J. McIntosh.
Second Lieut. Lester J. Whitlock.
Second Lieut. Hinton F. Longino.
Second Lieut. Frederick H. Black.
Second Lieut. Wilam B. Cobb.
Second Lieut. Angelus T. Burch.
Second Lieut. Chisholm Garland.
Second Lieut. Harvey Edward.
Second Lieut. George P. Hays.
Second Lieut. George W. Cassell.
Second Lieut. Ralph J. Canine.
Second Lieut. William L. Bally, jr.
Second Lieut. Donald A. Carson.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Wingate Battle.
Second Lieut. Harold B. Wharfield.
Second Lieut. Wade C. Gatchell.
Second Lieut. Norman D. Twichell.
Second Lieut. Andrew J. Wynne.
Second Lieut. Howard C. Wiener.
Second Lieut. Walter F. Goodman.
Second Lieut. Thomas M. Benson.
Second Lieut. Lucian K. Truscott, jr.
Second Lieut. Ralph E. Alstead.
Second Lieut. James H. Akerman.
Second Lieut. Raymond T. Connell.
Second Lieut. James N. W. McClure.
Second Lieut. Gabriel R. Mead.
Second Lieut. David McK. Wilson.
Second Lieut. Leonard M. Mertz.
Second Lieut. Ernest A. Williams.
Second Lieut. Slocum Kingsbury.
Second Lieut. George H. Millholland.

Second Lieut. Gardiner S. Platt.
 Second Lieut. Donald R. Dunkle.
 Second Lieut. Chester E. Davis.
 Second Lieut. Holmes G. Paullin.
 Second Lieut. John H. Irving.
 Second Lieut. Evan D. Cameron, jr.
 Second Lieut. William F. McLaughlin.
 Second Lieut. Glenn S. Finley.
 Second Lieut. Manly F. Meador.
 Second Lieut. Stephen W. Davis.
 Second Lieut. Clarence B. Werts.
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Unger.
 Second Lieut. William D. Tabor.
 Second Lieut. Edward M. Fickett.
 Second Lieut. James C. Van Ingen.
 Second Lieut. Callie H. Palmer.
 Second Lieut. Charles R. Chase.
 Second Lieut. Thomas F. Mishou, jr.
 Second Lieut. Robert B. Jackson.
 Second Lieut. Christopher C. Strawn.
 Second Lieut. John R. Breitinger.
 Second Lieut. Alfred J. de Lorimer.
 Second Lieut. William O. Coleman.
 Second Lieut. Herbert R. Sargent.
 Second Lieut. John E. Ketchum.

INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Seely B. Fahey.
 First Lieut. Philip S. Wood.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Eugene M. Frederick.
 Second Lieut. Cassius H. Styles.
 Second Lieut. Frederick J. Slackford.
 Second Lieut. Harold M. McClelland.

To be second lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Thomas Garlot Hannon.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Eugene G. Miller to be second lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Richard A. Ericson to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet Milo Benson Barragan to be second lieutenant.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Jerome P. Bowes, jr., to be second lieutenant.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Kelton L. Pepper to be captain.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Walter S. Crosley to be a captain.
 Commander Orton P. Jackson to be a captain.
 Commander Frank B. Upham to be a captain.
 Commander Clark D. Stearns to be a captain.
 Lieut. Commander Lloyd S. Shapley to be a commander.
 Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Fairfield to be a commander.
 Lieut. Edwin B. Woodworth to be a lieutenant commander.
 Lieut. Henry G. Fuller to be a lieutenant commander.
 The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Edwin A. Wolleson,
 Claude B. Mayo,
 Fletcher C. Starr,
 Charles F. Russell,
 Charles A. Dunn, and
 John W. Lewis.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Alson R. Simpson,
 Edgar M. Williams,
 George M. Lowry,
 John A. Byers,
 Edward O. McDonnell,
 Harold Dodd,
 Harold B. Grow,
 James A. Saunders,
 Robert D. Moore,
 Walter S. DeLany,
 Stephen B. Robinson,

Roscoe E. Schuirman,
 Hans Ertz,
 Charles W. McNair,
 Otto M. Forster,
 John Wilbur,
 Edward H. McKitterick,
 Laurence R. Brown,
 James C. Jones, jr.,
 John L. Hill,
 Norman C. Gillette, and
 Laurance T. DuBose.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Warner P. Portz,
 James M. Shoemaker,
 Edouard V. M. Isaacs,
 Robert M. Fortson,
 Dallas D. Dupre,
 Raymond Burhen,
 Frederic P. Culbert,
 Powell McC. Rhea,
 Philip C. Morgan,
 Frederick G. Richards,
 Chester E. Lewis,
 Isaac Schlossbach, and
 Joseph H. Chadwick.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns:

Maurice VanCleave and
 Harold A. Walker.

Medical Inspector Ammen Farenholt to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

Medical Inspector Middleton S. Elliott to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

Medical Inspector Dudley N. Carpenter to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors with the rank of commander:

Archibald M. Fauntleroy,
 Joseph P. Traynor,
 John L. Neilson,
 Charles C. Grieve,
 John D. Manchester,
 James S. Woodward, and
 James A. Randall.

Surg. Robert G. Heiner to be a medical inspector with the rank of commander.

Surg. Owen J. Mink to be a medical inspector with the rank of commander.

Surg. Harold W. Smith to be a medical inspector with the rank of commander.

Passed Asst. Surg. Micajah Boland to be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander.

Asst. Surg. Joel T. Boone to be a passed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant.

The following-named assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Reuben B. Anderson and
 Irvin Pope, jr.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant:

Joseph D. Halleck and
 Marion E. Harrison.

Asst. Dental Surg. Thomas J. Daly, jr., to be a passed assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Griffin G. Frazier and
 Carl S. Ziesel.

Dental Surg. Cedric T. Lynes to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Louis F. Snyder,
 Guy E. Nicholas,
 Francis S. Weir,
 Leon C. Frost,
 Anthony A. Norkiewicz,
 Alvin B. Ward,
 Eugene D. Jarboe,
 Spry O. Claytor,
 James M. Campbell, and
 John A. Walsh.

Dental Surg. David L. Cohen to be an assistant dental surgeon with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Howard R. McCleery,
George A. Collins, and
James F. McGrath.

The following-named chaplains to be chaplains with the rank of captain:

George L. Bayard and
Matthew C. Gleeson.

Acting Chaplain Roy L. Lewis to be a chaplain with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Acting Chaplain William W. Elder to be a chaplain with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Naval Constructor Lewis B. McBride to be a naval constructor with the rank of commander.

Assistant Naval Constructor Jerome C. Hunsaker to be a naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant:

Edmund R. Norton and
Andrew W. Carmichael.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains:

George B. Llewellyn,
William A. Fulkerson,
Ernest L. Jones,
William C. Milligan,
Edwin R. Wroughton,
William C. Carpenter, and
Charles L. Greene.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners:

Frederick Petry,
Frederick Evans,
Daniel F. Mulvihill,
Arthur T. Brill,
Michael Garland,
John C. Heck,
Arthur Boquett,
Sigvart Thompson,
Arthur S. Rollins,
Ward T. Hall,
Erich Richter,
Anthony E. Bentfeld,
John Harder,
John J. Welch, and
Charles C. Stotz.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:

Oliver T. Miller,
Walter S. Belknap,
John J. Coyle,
George C. Lacock, and
Anton Hengst.

Machinist Vincent F. Le Verne to be a chief machinist.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters:

Louis T. Herrmann and
Robert B. Pick.

The following-named pharmacists to be chief pharmacists:

John Haupt and
Charles E. Reinhardt.

Pay Clerk Alexander Riggins to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk Thomas C. Edrington to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk Robert C. Vasey to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk Melvin E. Throneson to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk William H. Abbey to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk Houston S. Stubbs to be a chief pay clerk.

Pay Clerk Herbert C. Lassiter to be a chief pay clerk.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wilson E. Madden, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Homer B. Gilbert to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John F. Atkinson, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Coburn S. Marston to be a lieutenant on the retired list.

Ensign Shirley A. Wilson, retired, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list.

Boatswain Henry Feehan, retired, to be a chief boatswain on the retired list.

Boatswain Alvah M. Smith, retired, to be a chief boatswain on the retired list.

Machinist Michael A. Rossiter, retired, to be a chief machinist on the retired list.

Commander Fletcher L. Sheffield, an additional number in grade, to be a captain, for temporary service.

Commander Herbert C. Cocke to be a captain, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Ray C. Billups,
Jesse G. Johnson,
Claude C. Levin,
Archibald F. Stanley,
Walter J. Nelson,
Stuart D. Preston,
James D. Veatch,
Ernest F. Janney,
Roy G. Whittemore,
Fletcher W. Browning,
Ralph W. Buchanan,
Denis B. Delaney,
Horace G. Barton,
Carl W. Hamilton,
Hurston S. Buck,
Clifton T. Miller,
James T. Rice,
Edward C. Bottomly,
Lyman LeR. Dixon,
Joseph J. Rochefort, and
Clarence E. Keller.

Dental Surg. Edwin N. Cochran, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be assistant dental surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

Pay Clerk Dillon F. Zimmerman to be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Acting Pay Clerk John W. Towery to be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Acting Pay Clerk George H. Upton to be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Assistant Paymaster Carswell C. Furr, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Assistant Paymaster Morris R. Grady, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant civil engineers, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Arthur M. Campbell,
Robert E. Hancock,
Paul F. Fagan,
Charles C. Mathis, and
William W. Schneider.

Boatswain William G. Platt to be a chief boatswain, for temporary service.

Gunner Arthur De Graw to be a chief gunner, for temporary service.

The following-named pharmacists to be chief pharmacists, for temporary service:

Edwin A. Rozea,
Lester E. Bote, and
Clarence Beasley.

Acting Pay Clerk John J. Solosky to be a chief pay clerk, for temporary service.

Ensign Raymond P. Le Viness, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Commander Harold E. Cook to be a captain for temporary service.

Commander John M. Enochs to be a captain for temporary service.

Lieut. Commander Ralph C. Parker to be a commander for temporary service.

Lieut. Commander Carl C. Krakow to be a commander for temporary service.

Lieut. Henry G. Fuller to be a lieutenant commander, for temporary service.

Ensign Edward Webb to be a lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Ensign John C. Williams to be a lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Ensign Walter S. Gabel, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Harold S. Bogan, chief quartermaster, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Harry W. Abrahams and
Arthur B. Robinson.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

George V. Morey,
Arthur L. Holcomb,

Charles W. Hinds,
Ashton B. Smith,
Ray Parrott, and
George Walker.

Ensign Ronald A. Cox, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Cecil G. Langdon,
Frederick A. Smith,
Lester C. Wishard,
Mars W. Palmer, and
Thomas G. Powers.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Frank T. Middleton,
Frank L. Arms, and
Bloomfield M. Fairbanks.

William R. Brown, chief quartermaster, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Ensign George W. Caldwell, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

William T. Burgess,
Thomas V. Corey,
James S. Bush,
Wallace H. Gregg,
Milton P. Wilson,
John J. O'Brien,
William H. Potter,
James P. McCarthy,
Russell A. Runyan,
Albert E. Bogdon,
Arthur J. Macdonald,
Culver Beebee,
James H. Rowley, jr.,
Eugene T. Auger,
George L. Bright,
Wesley E. Whitehouse,
Frederick A. Van Patten,
Roscoe N. Gary,
Earle R. Evans,
Charles R. Price,
J. E. Freeman,
William K. Boone, jr.,
Albert H. Schow,
William G. Dow,
Harvey R. Adams,
Harry E. Lucker,
John D. Vance,
Harry A. Swartz,
Archie E. Vanderwall,
Benjamin H. Taylor,
Thomas J. Bay,
Clarence E. Bence,
John P. Bowling,
R. J. Scofield,
Bennie B. Cutrer,
Thomas H. Galt,
Alexander W. MacNichol,
Lambert Muller-Thym,
Michael O'Sullivan,
R. S. Tewksbury,
Ches C. Childs,
Howard C. Ritter,
Joseph F. Taggard,
Edwin M. Brown,
Herbert B. Rowedder,
Joseph S. Borkoski,
Carleton B. Gildersleeve,
Myles J. Greene,
Lee L. Wilbur,
Donald H. Weaver,
Robert S. Witherington,
Henry P. Stelling,
Arthur J. Gibson,
Christopher C. Cox, jr.,
Harold B. Herty,
Eustace L. Adams,
Walter A. Donop,
Edwin H. Cole,
John McCormick,
Allan B. Pedin,
Julius F. Wilson,

Michael Warnick, jr.,
Arthur W. Daniels,
H. A. Currier Rose,
Milton T. Anderson,
Joseph L. Shotwell,
Arthur D. MacDonald,
Albert J. Burry,
Robert Robinson,
Albert M. Wright,
Henry I. Hyneman,
Bertrand Leppel,
Paul N. Baker,
Kenneth B. Galindo,
Samuel S. Fried,
Edwin D. Hale,
Milo Hazard,
Bernard S. Wilson,
Charles Wykoff,
Thomas A. McDonald,
Ralph A. Beardsley,
Fred J. Barden,
Ralph L. Smith,
Harry C. Uhl,
Walter Dickey,
Paul L. Mather,
Paul E. Hackett,
Philip D. B. Perham,
Herbert H. Taylor,
John M. Keep,
Bernard H. Kinnicutt,
Llewellyn B. Roberts,
William T. Reid,
Arthur E. Griffin,
Floyd J. Nuber,
Leedom B. Andrews,
Russell B. Osterholt,
Harry H. Iredell,
Thomas A. Hanna,
Charles H. Ross,
Robert W. Callahan,
Robert T. Greer,
Eugene O. Lovejoy,
Henry G. Erwin,
Russell R. Fling,
Ralph W. Floody,
John J. Reilly,
Charles K. Smith,
David B. Steffens,
Charles H. Miller,
Joseph W. Rixey,
Charles B. Carlon,
Joseph B. Benedict,
Jack V. Lund,
John L. Akins,
Clarence E. Kiefer,
William R. Burns,
Lawrence C. Hunt,
Harold P. Underwood,
Stephen A. Theard,
Julius F. Marullo,
Edwin J. Houghton,
John M. Higgins,
Clyde W. Brockett,
Edwin C. Millhouse,
Samuel J. Waddell,
Maynard L. Patton,
Raymond V. Wiman,
Charles M. Carroll,
Martin E. Didrichsen,
Charles W. Blodgett,
Julius A. Hobson, jr.,
Philip B. Wickes,
Harry T. Kelly,
Joseph P. Barry,
Charles J. Stadelman,
Frederick M. Wood,
Henry C. Roberts,
George K. G. Reilly,
Albert L. Demaree,
Joseph C. Powell,
John M. Ferry, jr.,
Samuel K. Waters,
Edward E. Scott,
John G. Doherty,
Barclay K. Read,

Charles R. Will,
Howard H. Wright,
Lewis Compton,
Carl A. Novinger,
Paul F. Carroll,
Fred S. Bristol,
Frank R. Walker,
Leon G. DeBrohun,
Joseph A. Guard,
Frank J. Gregory,
Victor J. Oliver,
William B. St. George,
John C. Carty,
Arthur D. Murphy,
Paul G. Wrenn,
Walter F. Hinckley,
Clyde C. Connor,
Robert G. Holden,
Glenn S. Holman,
John G. Maxwell,
Horace M. Rosebush,
David L. Ullman,
Clarence L. Waters,
Thomas W. D. Crockett,
John W. Darr,
Eben G. Bailey,
Albert Birkholz,
Edward P. Donnelly,
Frank W. Falen,
John M. Fewell,
William Gibson,
James Govoni,
Cecil H. Grant,
Harold E. Hansen,
Ralph L. Lovejoy,
Frank S. MacGreger,
Russell G. Phipps,
Myron T. Richardson,
Charles J. Stockman,
James H. Sullivan,
William J. Cruickshank,
Charles E. Lathrop,
Joseph G. Nevins,
Glenn W. Rodgers,
Frederick U. Weigert,
Hugo G. Werner,
George D. Young,
Robert K. Madsen, jr.,
H. William Hansen,
Herbert D. Holdridge,
John A. Smith,
Homer Howard,
Roy T. Hazzard,
Karl A. Drager,
Harrel R. Scott,
Matthias S. Clark,
Elmer O. Davis,
Ambrose L. Osborn,
Edwin J. Brandon,
Hjalmar Eclov,
James S. Warner,
John Schroeder,
Frederick J. Murphy,
Henry J. O'Donoghue,
Arthur J. Silva,
Harry R. Ewen,
Paul G. Haas,
Elmer C. Schacht,
Lynn G. Bricker,
George A. Moore,
James C. Taylor,
Harold W. Alden,
Charles L. Flory,
Raymond R. Morgan,
Robert F. Estill,
Russell Dodd,
William M. M. Lohrano,
Sam Stone Bush, jr.,
Claude M. Donahue,
William M. Junkin,
William A. Dobson,
Lawrence K. Powell,
Frederick J. Keller,
William H. Kershaw,
Arthur J. Feltault,

Harold C. Patterson,
Charles B. Barnard,
Arnold P. Harn,
Clifford C. Lucia,
Harris W. Reynolds,
John A. Sedgwick,
Willard Shaw,
Jackson R. Tate,
Julian A. McPhee,
Arthur W. Peterson,
Roy A. Ibach,
Esmond I. Parker,
Hugh P. Campbell, jr.,
Angus G. Nicolson,
George S. Bacon,
Lawrence F. Blodgett,
Willis C. Carling,
Orrin E. Cummings,
James D. Fisher,
Charles M. Fitzgerald,
William F. Fleming,
James E. Fraher,
Robert W. Grubb,
Casco C. Houghton,
Melville W. Lyon,
Donald McClary,
John H. Parsons,
David A. Peterson,
Arthur E. Pierce,
Clarence H. Pike,
Harold E. Ruisseau,
Ralph H. Smith,
Alan F. Winslow,
Thomas O. Brandon,
Frank Hill,
Jesse W. Broisseau,
Thomas J. Keane,
Clyde E. Brown,
Robert W. Dragoo,
Prentiss D. Moore,
George A. Douglass,
Raymond A. Gardner,
Howard W. Bradbury,
John A. Capocifolo,
Roger V. Mullany,
Charles Wayland,
Stanley F. Nolan,
Andrew D. White,
Clifton H. Cantelou,
John H. Cooper,
Albert A. Blumberg,
Edgar E. Ballard,
Russell D. Bell,
John F. Coady,
Thomas B. Eaton,
Solton Engel,
Charles C. Ferrenz,
Homer S. Fox,
Rufus C. Harding,
James S. Haughey,
William C. Hemphill,
Benjamin L. Hinckley,
Fred E. Hughes,
Frederick H. Lauder,
David Liebovitz,
Frank L. Lienhard,
Leroy G. Miller,
Joseph W. Mullally,
Henry L. Naff,
Frank L. Orr,
Claude T. Schaefer,
Roswell B. Sherman,
William A. Shy,
Allen McK. Slichter,
Herbert S. Torslett,
Carl H. Troeger,
Willard Von Pape,
Clarence E. Waterman,
Edwin O. Watkinson,
Herman C. Weidman,
Lester M. Wolf,
Horace G. Buckley,
Warren I. Fulton,
Mercer M. Fallon,
Fred D. Heegler,

Miles H. Gray,
 James B. Bliss,
 Warren H. Buchanan,
 Carl H. Cather,
 Benjamin F. Stairley,
 Dottie E. Zook,
 Arthur E. Roebke,
 James M. Fassett,
 James R. Hardie,
 James R. Peters,
 Clyde A. Coggins,
 Warren E. Lovejoy,
 David T. Evans,
 Martin M. Weisman,
 Nelson S. Hogan,
 John W. Welch,
 Alvin K. Holmes,
 Clifford Camp,
 Daniel L. Metts,
 Joseph P. Cremin,
 Joseph B. Weix,
 Frank L. Howard,
 Hilmar M. Hektner,
 Stonewall J. McMurray,
 Samuel R. Sloan,
 Carlyle M. Terry,
 Cyril J. Alt,
 Harry V. Barrow,
 Robert Blair,
 Charles L. Blatchford,
 Robert W. Boughter,
 Arthur N. Brabrook,
 Frank R. Brooks,
 Edward H. Brown,
 Henry B. Buckham,
 Richard C. Buckley,
 Horace D. Byington,
 Arthur M. Carden,
 William M. Cashin,
 Charles A. Christian,
 Carter B. Cook,
 Robert D. Cronly, 2d,
 John D. Crump,
 Raymond L. De Muro,
 Harold A. Drew,
 Carl W. Farrell,
 Hal S. Fewell,
 Russell L. Fillner,
 Howard W. Fletcher,
 George J. Flynn,
 Lester R. Gorman,
 Louis L. Green,
 Ray L. Hamilton,
 J. Gail Hanes,
 Herman J. Hanna,
 Ralph S. Holgerson,
 Edward J. Hopper, jr.,
 Harold M. Hubbard,
 Sidney L. Huff,
 Elmer D. Jensen,
 Otto F. Johanns,
 George E. Kenyon,
 Alphonsus L. Madden,
 Jonter A. Nicholls,
 Wilbur F. Peery,
 Ralph S. Pratt,
 Harry Redfern,
 Paul M. Rensing,
 Charles W. Roesel,
 Carl A. Ryder,
 Hugo F. Sasse,
 Eugene A. Schaal,
 Henry L. Schwartz,
 David J. Sharp,
 Hugo A. Stahl,
 George W. Stuart, jr.,
 Albert A. Walters,
 John F. Wegforth,
 Joseph E. Welsh,
 Carl E. Wiencke,
 Charles H. Edmiston,
 Fred C. Lewis,
 William H. Allen,
 William M. Kelso,
 William S. Evatt,

Herbert L. Prothers,
 John T. Garber,
 Russell S. Hook,
 Benton B. Baker,
 Frederick E. Dukes,
 Earl F. Mitchell,
 Ernest A. Cushman,
 Thomas W. Dixon,
 James A. Dwyer,
 Paul H. Eames,
 Frederick L. Farrell,
 James M. Fernald,
 Jonathan P. Gilmore,
 Benjamin S. Henderson,
 Percy W. Howard,
 Alan B. Hudson,
 William A. McCreery, jr.,
 Lorn C. McKinley,
 Chester D. McMillan,
 Loren H. Myers,
 Maurice A. O'Connor,
 Clifford B. Schiano,
 Harold B. Simmons,
 Francis A. Skelton,
 John F. Wall,
 Groff L. Woodward,
 John A. Paulson,
 Everett G. Mayes,
 Eugene T. M. Ashe,
 Peter S. Barbour,
 Fred L. Barnes,
 Charles D. Belding,
 Earle O. Bingham,
 Merritt A. Bittinger,
 George S. Blome,
 Orlo W. Bond,
 Leopold Boucher,
 Thomas R. Buckham, 2d,
 Albert R. Buehler,
 Don S. Burton,
 James F. Carukin,
 Edwin N. Cohen,
 William B. Coleman,
 Chester L. Connelly,
 Frank L. Conway,
 Roy C. Cooley,
 Harry C. Davies,
 Ross E. Denison,
 Leroy Dozier,
 Arthur W. Drummet,
 William D. Dwyer, jr.,
 Thomas H. Eaton,
 Francis J. Eberly,
 Theodore E. Emery,
 Russell L. Engle,
 Francis J. Enright,
 Charles P. Fahey,
 Harold S. Forgeron,
 Edgar A. Gardner,
 Vincent B. Gehlen,
 George S. Gelsanliter,
 Andrew A. Gerry,
 Herman A. Hansen,
 Charles E. Harbin,
 Thomas F. Hayes,
 Russell G. Herron,
 Walter L. Holmgren,
 John P. Horgan,
 Francis P. Hornaday,
 James H. Houser,
 Carleton G. Howe,
 Francis DeW. Hurd,
 Myron L. Hyman,
 Edgar J. James,
 Chester M. Jenkins,
 Elder P. Johnson,
 Forrest E. Johnson,
 Reuben H. Johnson,
 John J. Jordan,
 Edwin M. Joslyn,
 Jacob F. Kiefer,
 John W. Kimmman,
 Edward V. Kurtzrock,
 Charles W. LaBlanc,
 John A. Lemmer,

Henry M. Lewis, jr.,
Herbert Loewy,
Clarence Z. Logan,
George L. Lynch,
Robert MacIntyre,
Harry McK. Martens,
Merritte M. Maxwell,
John W. McCrae,
Arthur L. McElroy,
Zerah B. Miles,
Paul C. Monser,
Paul Moore,
Harold F. Nickerson,
Arthur M. Nolan,
Arthur L. Nunn,
Raymond E. Overmire,
Andrew C. Panella,
John W. Patrick,
John G. Patterson,
Lisle L. Pollock,
Langdon A. Pope,
Benjamin C. Purrington,
Evard E. Puryear,
Alfred G. Rauffer,
Harry N. Rooney,
Leo D. Rosenak,
John K. Ross,
Sigfred A. Sandeen,
John H. Schad,
Charles W. Schofield,
Alfred C. Schroeder,
George B. Service,
Harold G. Seyler,
Timothy A. Sheehan,
William J. Sheerin,
George W. Silsby, jr.,
Harold C. Smith,
Irving B. Smith,
Leland R. Smith,
Emil L. Stephenson,
Waymon A. Stephenson,
Robert F. Stockin,
John E. Stoddard,
Floyd E. Sullivan,
Louis C. Summers,
John E. Swaysland,
James A. Taylor, jr.,
Frederick L. Thompson,
George E. Thompson,
Dorian E. Todd,
Haskell C. Todd,
Joseph P. Tomelty,
Cecil S. Travis,
Arvid Tripp,
Eldron F. Tripp,
George H. Trubenback,
Sheldon K. Turner,
George E. Underhill,
Harold J. Walker,
Florentin P. Wencker,
James L. Wheelock,
William H. Wilhelm,
Raymond W. Robertson,
Albert L. Schrader,
Luman F. Marsh,
Arthur H. Small,
Bernard R. Lewis,
Henry A. Tyburc,
Cyril P. Connolly,
Thomas C. Kizer,
Paul R. Conley,
Philander M. Smith,
Charles D. Hickox,
Alfred B. Berlin,
Charles J. Wolf, jr.,
George H. Pratt,
Dallas M. Stephens,
Norman W. Eberle,
Walter A. Nelson,
Frank Urban,
Francis S. McCabe,
Charles W. Kellogg,
Alfred D. Bosley,
Jennings B. Rudisill,
John Armstrong,

Leslie J. Arnold,
Denzil F. Balthis,
Edwin L. Barr,
Harold W. Bentley,
Frank A. Blomberg,
Ralph W. Bowers,
Andrew Boyd, jr.,
Robert C. Browne,
George H. Burrows,
Robert T. Carey,
Horace F. Chandler,
Willis H. Chase,
Vincent F. Clark,
Elmer A. Cottier,
Albert E. Crabtree,
Ernest S. Croasdale,
James J. Cunningham,
Daniel M. Diener,
Elmer O. Dobroth,
Durbin R. Downey,
William R. Drachbar,
William H. Eichorn,
Abraham R. Elson,
John E. Engs, jr.,
Henry L. Ewbank,
Hugh J. Fanning,
Lauren W. Faulkner,
Lynn Fausett,
George R. Fitzsimons,
James H. Foskett,
Stephen P. Fox,
Stuart K. Fox,
John R. Fristoe,
James D. George,
Harry D. Goldy,
Joseph W. Golinkin,
Richard F. Graner,
Fred J. Haigis,
William R. Hanrahan,
Howell Hedrick,
Virgil E. Hendrickson,
Abraham A. Henning,
Howard C. Hirsch,
Frank M. Hopper,
John F. Hrivnak,
Wilbert L. Hunt,
Harold K. Jackson,
Gustave A. Jetter, jr.,
Cecil C. Johnson,
Leon J. Johnson,
Webb W. Jordan,
Edward C. King,
Bryan E. Langston,
Winfred W. Liddell,
Robert H. Long,
Malcolm D. MacGregor,
Gordan J. Malone,
Anton L. Mare,
Claire H. Masters,
George A. Maven,
Joseph J. McCann,
William C. McClure,
Elbert E. McGee,
James J. McGlynn,
John D. McNamar,
Edward L. Micheau,
Frank Miller,
Joseph T. Moran, jr.,
Charles E. Movius,
Leonard J. Mulrooney,
John D. Murphy,
Basil Neel,
Le Roy A. Nelson,
Robert W. Nicholas,
Paul F. Opp,
Robert E. Permut,
Maurice W. Piper,
Raymond E. Proom,
Otto F. Reis,
Paul G. Robinson,
Errol V. Rosenthal,
Joseph A. Ruetty,
Joseph H. Seyfreid,
Jesse B. Short,
Lowe P. Siddons,

Richard J. Sloman,
 Jeremiah Smith,
 Raymond O. Smith,
 Renshaw Smith, jr.,
 Robert D. Stewart,
 Sedgwick W. Stiles,
 Herman M. Stone,
 William L. Travis,
 Charles W. Wallace,
 Charles D. Warner,
 John E. Weaver,
 Donald M. Weld,
 William J. Williams,
 Stanley B. Zaring,
 Clement H. Watson,
 Frederick W. Hamilton,
 William W. McQueen,
 Nat H. Hayes,
 Philip M. Cooper,
 Edward A. Morris,
 Hugh E. Dischinger,
 Stanley E. Eikenberry,
 Jay P. Gwaltney,
 William L. Day,
 Arden H. Brockbank,
 Cyril E. Taylor,
 Irvin M. Hansen,
 James K. Fuller,
 Lurton F. Gottlieb,
 Elliott C. Newell,
 David M. Evans,
 Floyd Gills,
 Walter B. Warner,
 George L. Nicholas,
 William C. Strowd,
 Everette H. Croxton,
 Courtenay S. Overin,
 Philip M. Fisher, jr.,
 Joseph P. Ryan,
 John A. Chisholm,
 Paul J. Leavens,
 Gaylord N. Hess,
 Herbert N. Royden, jr.,
 Donald B. Hyde,
 Louis C. DeRochemont,
 Harold B. Corwin,
 Edward R. J. Griffin,
 Alden M. Bartlett,
 John A. Pierson,
 Albert L. Prosser,
 Richard H. Brazeal,
 Philip F. Breen,
 Claude P. Crankshaw,
 William T. Swain,
 Harold S. Fraine,
 James E. Dwyer,
 Edward P. Murray,
 Robert W. Hawes,
 Joseph S. Donnell, jr.,
 Charles C. Ratner,
 Frank R. Horton,
 Richard H. Morris,
 James B. Wallace,
 Raymond J. Bruning,
 Joseph F. Keenan,
 Seth F. H. Lagerstadt,
 George M. Illich,
 Frank Fendel,
 Hyman L. Heller,
 J. Fred Nutter,
 Hugo M. Rosenberg,
 William L. Hickey,
 John C. Weare,
 James R. Keiser,
 Herbert B. Butcher,
 J. I. Charles Taylor,
 John G. Winn,
 Emanuel Taylor,
 Karl E. Madden,
 Erland F. Andrew,
 Percival B. Truslow,
 Laurence Thompson,
 Marshall A. Townsend,
 William E. Martens,
 Fox Trimble,
 William I. Thompson,

George E. Twining,
 Patrick E. Seawright,
 Joseph H. Twiss,
 Hamlet W. Scott,
 Lawrence J. Archer, jr.,
 Clarence J. Ragle, and
 Richard N. Donelson.

Ensign Arthur K. Aranoff, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Alexander Martin McMahon,
 William Miller, and
 Karl Sommerfeld.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns, for temporary service:

William Olsen,
 Frank Schweinhoffer, and
 John Campbell Dallas.

Ensign Clarence T. Bunker, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Fred W. Darnell,
 Harrell Clifford,
 Lawrence Bennett,
 Norman M. Nelson,
 Albert J. Steelman,
 Harold J. Bellingham,
 Albert M. Van Eaton,
 Lester W. Hansen,
 Edmond F. Maxwell,
 Harold R. Anderson,
 John E. Gabrielson,
 Thomas V. Hughes,
 Rowland H. Koenig,
 Clyde L. Lee,
 Harold Ramslie,
 Andrew J. George,
 George C. Weldin,
 Walter O. Roenicke, and
 Harold E. Gray.

Ensign Albert H. Roos, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Ensign Nelson H. Eisenhardt, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Frederick O. Krueger,
 Sumner C. Cheever,
 Harold H. Kendrick,
 Walter W. Heathman,
 Ethan J. G. Allen,
 Sam J. Strother,
 Albert E. Conlon,
 Oliver L. Brillhart,
 Jerome F. Krutmeyer,
 Felix G. Chouinard,
 Leland W. Sweeney,
 Louis K. Melbye,
 Adolphus I. Baker,
 William H. Frost,
 Robert P. Gillam,
 William A. Lower,
 Carleton D. Moore,
 William A. Geary,
 Richard G. Noyes, and
 Victor F. Youngman.

Ensign Charles G. Miller, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

Gunner Fred Beauford Chilson to be an ensign, for temporary service.

John Thomas Sunderman, chief quartermaster, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Bellinger Dunham,
 Alexander J. R. Ferguson,
 James C. Andrews,
 Dean H. Beeman,
 Gerald O. Boland,
 Samuel E. Cunningham,
 Chase H. Daugherty,
 Gustav J. Dohrenwend, jr.,
 Dempsey K. Dodge,
 John P. Doyle,

Edward J. Fitzwilliam,
Earl A. Giantvalley,
Gustavus H. Griffin,
Walter E. Hall,
Frederick W. Hollingshead,
Gail P. Helgeson,
Virl Z. Hill,
Charles H. Kay,
Alfred L. Lind,
Lawrence C. Lovejoy,
Ransom F. Maddux,
John J. Manning,
Byron F. Murklee,
Albert J. Petrusek,
William J. Platt,
William F. Raftery,
Elijah J. Reeves,
Joseph I. Rogers,
Ralph G. Slater,
Walter D. Thompson, jr.,
Louis Weiss, and
Charles J. Wideman,

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

John L. Albice,
Joseph E. Jackson, and
Meinrad A. Schur.

William L. Lewis, chief quartermaster, to be an ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Horace K. Hutchens,
John H. Gwathmey,
Robert Petross,
Forrest A. Rhoads,
Evander P. Bateham,
Harry H. Baumgartner,
Roscoe H. Schell,
Edward M. Gleason, jr.,
Earl V. Kaufman,
Orion H. Reeves,
Bernard J. Loughman,
William W. Behrens,
Rody Patterson,
John F. McMenamin,
Walter E. Medford,
Lewis R. McDowell,
Russell C. Bartman,
Harry Q. Taylor,
William D. Hodges,
Bernhard H. Wolter,
Kenneth C. Manning,
Cyril W. Connolly,
Joseph L. Fendrich, jr.,
Raymond A. McClellan,
Charles G. Drasher,
Stephen A. Mileham,
Joseph C. Frearson,
Charles H. Butcher,
Thomas B. O'Connell,
Ferdinand H. de Bermingham, jr.,
Scott A. Fuller,
George O. Spaur,
Frederick W. Sievert,
Leigh C. Stewart,
Carl M. Platz,
Lawrence H. Cook,
George D. Birdsall,
Leon J. Benwell,
Harold R. Holcomb,
Samuel J. McKee,
Ralph A. Branham,
Harold J. Kircher,
Edward M. Petterson,
Bryan Jones,
Harry Fredman,
Ray W. Bridenbecker,
George S. Pomeroy, jr.,
William J. Long,
Nullet F. Schneider,
Gordon T. House,
Forest O. Conser,
Dana R. Curry,
Forman Hamilton,
John A. Heiser, jr.,
Marshall W. Hettick,

William W. Maurer, and
Henry G. Walsh.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Albert E. Man,
Lincoln Humphreys,
Henry C. Weber,
Albin H. Cecha,
Ernest F. Slater,
Richard M. Little,
Walter P. Keene,
Marshall H. Hood,
Rudolph C. Miller,
Irving E. Stowe,
Carl C. Hugger,
William J. Walsh,
Francis P. Field,
Fleete S. Steele,
Thomas M. Kelly,
William A. Gills,
Axiphar A. Marsteller,
Percy F. McMurdo,
Harry W. Croop,
Max Silverman,
John A. Topper,
John W. Green,
Edward M. Steger,
Harry E. Murphy,
Carl J. Robertson,
Joash I. Yohannan,
John C. W. Taylor,
Samuel W. Connor,
Chester F. McGill,
Leland M. French,
Ward C. Alden,
Maurice S. Mathis,
Robert F. Schanz,
Henry L. Dyer,
Franklyn A. Howell,
Thomas C. Quirk,
Claude E. Smith,
Allen G. Ireland,
Earl E. Dockrey,
Frank H. Towner,
Thomas C. Eley,
Herbert G. Hughes,
Alfred L. Potter,
James E. Burgman,
Gregory L. Robillard,
Lloyd F. Craver,
Alfred N. Sweet,
Jacob Skeer,
Paul F. Cope,
Richard N. Mackey,
Ross U. Whiteside,
Gustavus A. Schaub,
Charles Wheatley,
Charles D. Sinkinson, jr.,
Francis E. Hypes,
Harold C. Kelley,
Harry B. Spaulding,
James E. Fetherston,
Albert H. Faber,
Bert N. Wright,
Alfred S. Grussner,
Ambrose J. Callaghan,
Kenneth S. Davis,
Joseph N. Gehlen,
Richard F. Mullin,
John W. Wear, jr.,
Clarence N. Smith,
Gustave R. Petz,
William G. Rowe,
John G. Davis,
Anton R. Schier,
Thomas F. Long,
Felix O. Bell,
William A. Simpson,
William S. Bunkley,
Joseph J. Horton,
Alfred H. Ehrenclou,
Gleaves B. Kenny,
Roger D. Mackey,
Douglas C. McBride,
Earle E. Sullivan,

William J. Rogers,
George G. Herman,
George P. Quinn,
Roy J. Leutscher,
Joshua H. Harris,
Benjamin H. Adams,
Isom A. Rankin,
Walter G. Hausheer,
Daniel Luttinger,
William C. Lyon,
Frederick Ludwig,
Francis L. Hughes,
Cyrus R. Currier,
Ernest L. Tracy,
Henry L. Fougereousse,
Otis B. Spalding,
Willard W. Wild,
Lawrence W. Ehegartner,
David E. Horrigan,
Norman S. Betts,
Elba B. Todd,
Arthur H. Flickwir,
J. Howard Branan,
Marvin B. Glismann,
Lea B. Sartin,
Victor B. Riden,
Frank Sabiston,
Albert H. Aldridge,
Leon H. Griggs,
Franklin P. Dwinell,
James P. Bowles,
George M. Le Gallee,
Clyde W. Brunson,
Chauncey D. Miller,
James E. Purdy,
John P. Gilmer,
Foster C. Rulison,
David W. Eisenberg,
Sydney Walker, jr.,
Francis H. Webster,
Herbert C. Gifford,
James D. Blackwood, jr.,
David C. Thompson,
Worcester R. Angell,
Llewellyn C. Merrill,
Houston R. Farley,
George M. Malkin,
Benjamin G. Baker,
Zachariah A. Barker, and
John B. Bostick,

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant dental surgeons, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Nicholas S. Duggan,
William J. Rogers,
Chester H. Webber,
Martin P. Kane,
Charles E. Detmer,
Frank B. Ferrill,
Horace S. Hursh,
Howard C. Miller,
Anton C. Tranchina,
Edward B. Howell,
Philip H. MacInnis,
Daniel A. Doherty,
George S. Maynard,
Joseph E. Sullivan,
Albion C. Tollinger,
Edmund Laughlin,
John A. Waters,
Edward J. Fitzgerald,
Carlton B. Morse,
Benjamin H. Barton,
Tyler W. Spear, and
James J. Spring.

Pay Inspector Ray Spear to be a pay director, with the rank of captain, for temporary service.

Pay Clerk Chauncey G. Olinger to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward L. Rowse, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Asst. Paymaster Cyrus B. Kitchen, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Acting Pay Clerk William A. White to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Guy J. Cheatham,
Paul J. Fleming,
Walter W. Mahany,
Harry J. Gillen,
John H. Davis,
Harold T. Smith, and
Charles J. Lanier.

Acting Pay Clerk Otis C. Pettit to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Asst. Paymaster Joseph J. Lyman, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Herman Schwartz,
Herman McInturff, and
Charles W. Albrecht.

Acting Pay Clerk David W. Robinson to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Naval Constructor Lewis B. McBride to be a naval constructor, with the rank of captain, for temporary service.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors, with the rank of commander, for temporary service:

Jerome C. Hunsaker,
Edmund R. Norton, and
Ralph D. Weyerbacher.

Carpenter Ralph M. Munson to be an assistant naval constructor, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Carpenter Robert J. Leahy to be an assistant naval constructor, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harold Larner, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant naval constructor, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Carpenter John Reid, jr., to be an assistant naval constructor, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Civil Engineer Reuben E. Bakenhus to be a civil engineer, with the rank of captain, for temporary service.

The following-named civil engineers to be civil engineers, with the rank of commander, for temporary service:

Kirby Smith and
Glenn S. Burrell.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant civil engineers, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Clyde W. Coryell,
Harold K. Hughes,
Charles B. Watkins,
Edward M. Frost, and
Herbert L. Voight.

The following-named citizens to be assistant civil engineers, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Harold F. L. Pfohl,
Edward D. Graffin, and
Ferdinand E. Hayes, jr.

Boatswain John C. Baldwin to be a chief boatswain, for temporary service.

Machinist Shine S. Halliburton to be a chief machinist, for temporary service.

Machinist Stephen B. Thornton to be a chief machinist, for temporary service.

Carpenter Alfred Erickson to be a chief carpenter, for temporary service.

Carpenter Merick A. Beach to be a chief carpenter, for temporary service.

The following-named pharmacists to be chief pharmacists, for temporary service:

William F. Bly,
Datus M. Hervey,
Thomas L. Hildreth,
Glenn F. Lyon,
Robert D. Anderson,
Harold S. Austin,
Harold B. Chatfield,
John P. Cooney,
Charles H. Dean,
James F. Durkin,
Henry L. Greenough,

Harvey H. Hogue,
 Chauncey R. Holmes,
 John K. Holmes,
 William H. Huston,
 Robert Martin,
 Frank D. Mears,
 William J. Riney,
 Kenneth M. Smith,
 William L. Stewart,
 Joseph A. Libbon,
 Henry P. Knowles,
 John J. Lergenmiller,
 Hubert E. Randolph,
 Harold L. Ryan,
 Charlie R. Steen,
 Joseph O. E. Hummell,
 Willard A. Jackson,
 Chester O. Kimball,
 Roscoe W. King,
 Walter C. Magoon,
 Foster B. Redman,
 Leland Rowe,
 Ertel E. Weaver,
 Guy O. Wildasin,
 Edward F. Aron,
 Richard M. Dunphy,
 William F. Sheridan,
 William E. G. Bartle,
 William F. Crell,
 Jack K. Diamond,
 Clement Duchesney,
 Alfred L. Eldridge,
 Allen J. Hueschling,
 Benjamin E. Irwin,
 Briggs C. Jones,
 James A. Kirkpatrick,
 Thomas F. Meagher,
 Julius H. Mexer,
 Albert B. Montgomery,
 Frank E. O'Reilly,
 Lindsey W. Rider,
 Hjalmar Rydeen,
 Norman L. Saunders,
 Hawthorne Tolderlund,
 Theodore B. Wiggins,
 Franklyn G. Wetherell,
 Joseph Levansaler,
 John H. Reed,
 Harry L. Rogers, and
 Walter Zur-Linden.

Lieut. Shirley A. Wilson, retired, to be a lieutenant commander on the retired list, for temporary service.

Lieut. John L. Fox, retired, to be a lieutenant commander on the retired list, for temporary service.

Commander Powers Symington to be a captain.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Benyaurd B. Wygant and
 Burrell C. Allen.

Lieut. Commander Walter N. Vernou to be a commander.

Lieut. James J. Manning to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Charles G. Davy to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Richard R. Mann to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Horace T. Dyer to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Charles C. Gill to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Augustin T. Beauregard to be a lieutenant commander.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Harold W. Scofield,

Beriah M. Thompson,

William H. P. Blandy,

Elmer L. Woodside,

Glenn B. Davis,

Palmer H. Dunbar, jr.,

George W. Wolf,

Roy Dudley,

James E. Brenner, and

Karl E. Hintze.

Ensign Arthur Landis to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Surg. John T. Kennedy to be a medical inspector, with the rank of commander.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters, with the rank of lieutenant commander:

Elwood A. Cobey and

Robert S. Chew, jr.

Boatswain James Reilly to be a chief boatswain.

Gunner George W. Waldo to be a chief gunner.

Pay Clerk William C. Jahnke to be a chief pay clerk.

Brig. Gen. (temporary) Smedley D. Butler to be a colonel in the Marine Corps.

Col. (temporary) George C. Thorpe to be a colonel in the Marine Corps.

Col. (temporary) Alexander S. Williams to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

Lieut. Col. (temporary) Julius S. Turrill to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

Maj. (temporary) Harold F. Wirgman to be a major in the Marine Corps.

Maj. (temporary) Joseph A. Rossell to be a major in the Marine Corps.

Col. Logan Feland to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

Lieut. Col. Harold C. Snyder to be a colonel in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

Lieut. Col. Alexander S. Williams to be a colonel in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

Maj. Howard H. Kipp to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

Maj. Ellis B. Miller to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps, for temporary service:

Evans O. Ames,

Stanley M. Muckleston, and

William H. Davis.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service:

Robert A. Barnet, jr.,

Frank B. Wilbur,

Francis B. Reed,

Lester D. Johnson,

John Kaluf,

Judson H. Fitzgerald,

Samuel A. Milliken,

Henry D. F. Long,

James Diskin,

Ross L. Iams,

Lee Carter,

George Nielsen,

Wyle J. Moore,

Charles D. Baylis,

Richard B. Dwyer,

William G. Kilgore,

Harry E. Leland,

Winfield S. Cranmer,

John F. Leslie,

David R. Nimmer,

Georges F. Kremm,

Walter H. Batts,

Trevor G. Williams,

David L. Ford,

Josephus Daniels, jr.,

Horace Talbot,

Edward B. Moore,

Frank W. Hemsoth,

Emil M. Northenscold,

David Kipness,

Robert K. Ryland,

William D. Wray,

Uley O. Stokes,

Charles P. Phelps,

Sherman L. Zea, and

Harold W. Whitney.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service.

Herbert S. Keimling,

Ramie H. Dean,

Raymond P. James,

Fred J. Zinner,

Reuben E. Puphal,

Stephen Skoda,

Harold A. Strong,

James E. Foster,

Clarence L. Seward, jr.,

William A. Siefer,

Wilbur T. Love,

William S. Fellers,

Henning F. Adickes,

Roy W. Conkey,

Samuel H. Wood,

Merile H. Stevenson,
 Augustus Paris,
 Chester E. Orcutt,
 Louis B. West,
 Denzil R. Fowls,
 Forest J. Ashwood,
 George C. Buzby,
 Augustus H. Fricke,
 Edward M. Butler,
 Thomas J. Caldwell,
 Louis E. McDonald,
 George H. Townner, jr.,
 Robert A. Cobban,
 Stephen E. St. George,
 Louis Cukela,
 James M. Burns, jr.,
 Emmons J. Robb,
 Allan S. Heaton,
 Erwin F. Schaefer,
 Daniel D. Thompson,
 Wilbur Summerlin,
 Charles F. Commings,
 Walter W. Wensinger,
 Robert O. Williams,
 John T. Stanton,
 Virgil P. Schuler,
 Harry S. Davis,
 Peter P. Wood,
 Lawrence E. Westerdahl,
 David N. Richeson,
 Merle J. Van Housen,
 James C. Leech,
 Richard S. Ross,
 Vinton H. Newell,
 Emmitt R. Wolfe,
 Stephen A. Norwood,
 Raymond A. O'Keefe,
 Frank M. Cross,
 George W. McHenry,
 Gale T. Cummings,
 Charles W. Holmes,
 Samuel H. Woods,
 Wilbur Eickelberg,
 Robert A. Butcher,
 Allen J. Burris,
 Earl M. Rees, and
 Carl Gardner.

Maj. (temporary) Arthur P. Crist, retired, to be a major in the Marine Corps on the retired list.

Maj. (temporary) Thomas F. Lyons, retired, to be a major in the Marine Corps on the retired list.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, give us, we beseech Thee, the courage, the strength, the fortitude to cast out the demons which are lying in wait to enter and corrode the soul of man, such as egotism, covetousness, jealousy, hate, revenge, and all that brood of vipers which follow in their wake; that we may develop the angels of love and good will.

"Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

"For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

"And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, the highest privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate yesterday on the prohibition enforcement bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] used the following language, which appears on page 2572 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 14, 1919, to wit:

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first two words. I am opposed to this amendment unless the gentleman from Kentucky will provide that the inspector and agents visit the House Office Building. Then I will vote for his amendment. Before this debate is concluded I shall ask that every Member of Congress who votes dry on this proposition be honest to his country and his conscience and that he place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amount of liquor that he has saved up for himself either in his home or in his office. If the Congress wants to be on the level with the country, it will do as I ask. The country is told that this Congress is overwhelmingly dry. I have been a Member of this Congress since 1914, and I have found it overwhelmingly wet. Now, why—why, in the days when you are making the world safe for democracy and freedom—why tie up the individual unless you are willing, Members of Congress, to tie up yourselves? I have heard, Mr. Chairman, of Members of this House who have said that they have in their private wine cellars enough liquor to take care of them and their friends for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I submit respectfully that this is a reflection upon the integrity and the standing of every Member of this Congress. It gives out to the world—and so the morning papers report—that while the Members of Congress are seeking to place prohibition upon the people of the country the Members of this House have stored away, even in their offices in the House Office Building, a Government institution, if you please, enough liquor to last 20 years for the private use of themselves and their friends.

I submit that it is an unwarranted aspersion upon the standing and the integrity and the dignity of this House, whose Members are as strictly sober as any 435 men with whom I have ever been associated before.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think, on the question of what is the privilege of the House, that there is a line of wavering degree. The Chair is disposed to think that the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] were not an assault upon the privileges of this House and that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the Chair recognize me to offer a motion to expunge those unwarranted and unfair remarks from the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. The House has its remedy for that.

Mr. BLANTON. You can not do it in the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not a question of privilege.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916;

S. 180. An act for the incorporation of the Near East Relief Association;

S. 715. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; and

Senate concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany in the English text alone and without maps, 10,000 of which shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 40,000 for the use of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 715. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall, at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senate concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany in the English text alone and without maps, 10,000 of which shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 40,000 for the use of the Senate—

to the Committee on Printing.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. , being a bill "making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; that the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with; that there shall be two hours of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]; that at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read; that on the reading of the bill no amendment shall be in order except germane amendments to the following paragraph, which paragraph is made in order on page 19 of said bill:

"Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$6,000,000, of which sum not exceeding \$15,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided in Government-owned buildings by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum and rates above that sum, except not to exceed the following: One at \$5,000, 2 at \$5,000 each, 23 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each, 27 at \$3,500 each, 70 at \$3,000 each, 60 at \$2,750 each, and 100 at \$2,500 each."

That at the conclusion of the reading of said bill it shall be reported to the House with such amendments as may be made to the paragraph specified as being subject to amendments. Thereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman this: What do we want with any two hours' debate on this thing?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, suggested two hours of general debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What are we going to debate?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I assume to make some explanation of the hearings that were held, covering a period of more than 12 hours and covering some 150 to 200 pages on this general subject. I assume that it is for the purpose of making an explanation to the House of the paragraphs that are made in order on the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me every man in the House knows what this proposition is, and every man in the House has made up his mind on it, and every man should vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The time need not be consumed if the Members do not desire to use it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kansas or the Speaker, one or the other, or both, what about the veto? We are not going to take this thing up before we vote on the veto, are we?

Mr. GOOD. The veto message has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations and is still in that committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but you have got to vote on it.

Mr. GOOD. Not necessarily.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The veto message defeats the bill, if the House does not reconsider it. The Committee on Appropriations have reported out a new bill with a new number for the consideration of the House, and have taken it up de novo.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is the same old bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; but it is introduced under a new number and is to be considered de novo in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not imperative to vote on the veto?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The veto message came to the House. The Constitution provides that there shall be consideration of the bill. The House referred the message and bill to the committee. Now, if the committee brings out a bill in accord with the suggestion of the President's veto and the House passes it in that form, it seems to the Chair action on the veto itself is not required. The Chair will look that up.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How do we come to be considering this proposition now when no attention is paid to the veto?

The SPEAKER. The veto message, with the bill, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, that committee has reported out a new bill. The veto message and the original bill are still slumbering in the Committee on Appropriations, and the Chair thinks—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me this way, if the Chair will permit: We pass a bill in due form and the President vetoes it, and the veto is the only excuse that we have for going into this proposition that is brought in here by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. It seems to me the Constitution is imperative. It says that when the President returns a bill to the House in which it originated with his veto, immediately the House shall reconsider the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. Now, for the sake of convenience, in days gone by the House has juggled with that word "immediately," and I am not insisting on the liberal dictionary meaning of it now. They have postponed action from time to time, and some of the veto messages were sent to committee and never reported back.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the action of the House in voting to refer the bill, with the veto, to the Committee on Appropriations is not such reconsideration as is contemplated by the constitutional provision?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, no. The constitutional provision means that you shall consider that veto and pass on it, and the only excuse that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and his conferees have for bringing in this rule is that the veto ought to be disposed of first.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Constitution simply require that the bill which is vetoed shall be reconsidered?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course it does, but it has never been reconsidered; and the Constitution provides, further, for the calling of the roll, and those in favor of reconsideration vote yea and those opposed to it vote nay, and it is the only place in our system of government where you must call the roll. There has been no constitutional disposition of it at all. The roll has not been called.

Mr. DUPRÉ. We have got two sundry civil bills before the House at one time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So the upshot of the whole thing, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] suggests sotto voce, is that we have two sundry civil bills before us at one time, or will have if this rule reported by the gentleman from Kansas prevails.

Mr. DUPRÉ. They have introduced another sundry civil bill, with the veto pending.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have another sundry civil bill introduced, with the veto pending, as the gentleman from Louisiana says.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then, if the House should override the veto of the President, the bill would be passed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] suggests, if the House should override the veto, why, then there would not be a particle of sense in this performance introduced here by the gentleman from Kansas. It would be an absolute superfluity.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will look at paragraph 105 of the Manual, he will see that a motion to refer a vetoed bill, either with or without the veto message, has been held allowable and within the constitutional mandate that "the House shall proceed to reconsider." I think the distinguished gentle-

man from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], when he occupied the high place of Speaker of the House in the Sixty-fifth Congress, followed that precedent in the case of a vetoed bill by suggesting that a motion to refer was within the direction of the Constitution that it should be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question never was raised when I was Speaker, and I want it understood once more that I am not bound as a Member of the House by what I did as Speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I think that may be fortunate for the present House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the decisions on this point are clear. In Hinds' Precedents, section 3550, it says:

A motion to refer a vetoed bill, either with or without the message, has been held allowable within the constitutional mandate that the House "shall proceed to reconsider."

And, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] states, there have been many cases where bills have been referred to a committee and no further action has been taken upon them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Chair will permit, that was simply to get rid of the bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the reason of the rule and the reason of the constitutional mandate are fully observed by the action that was taken in this case. Of course, the purpose is that the President's will shall receive the consideration of the House. If the House by a two-thirds vote overrules the President's veto, that defeats the will of the President, and therefore it is provided that that shall be done by a roll call; but in the present instance the committee, as the Chair is advised, have reported, conformably with the suggestion of the President, a new bill, so that all the House has to do, if it does not desire to act in accord with the President, is to defeat the bill which now comes forth, and that defeat can be accomplished, not by a two-thirds vote but by a majority vote, so that in this case the purpose of the Constitution to allow the will of the President to be expressed is being carried out more completely than by the technical yea-and-nay vote, upon which two-thirds are required. At any rate, the precedents fully justify the action of the committee. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the Chair—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think after the Chair has ruled there should be further discussion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the Chair a new question. What becomes of the direction in the Constitution that there shall be a yea-and-nay vote on it?

The SPEAKER. As the Chair said, it has been decided a number of times that by referring the bill to the committee no further action need be taken upon it. It has been decided by a long course of precedents, as the gentleman from Missouri is aware. The committee can report it back and then when the bill is before the House it requires a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WINGO. If the logic of the Speaker is correct, would not we find ourselves in this situation: You dispose of the veto of the President without a record vote of the House, and would not you dispose of the veto by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. If the House wants to bring the veto before it, all it has to do is to discharge the committee.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized to make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. Is it not a privileged motion? That is the subject matter of the President's veto; we are acting on a constitutional matter, and is it not true that the highest privileged motion is in order at any time during the proceedings?

The SPEAKER. Exactly; but that is not now before the House. The President's veto and the bill are in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WINGO. The committee brings in a new bill, which is not privileged, which makes this rule necessary, and is it not a matter of higher privilege to move to discharge the committee, and has it not been so decided?

The SPEAKER. That might be, if the gentleman had the floor, but the question before the House now is on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. If that be true, you can defeat a question of the highest privilege by the Rules Committee coming in and cutting that out. So that a motion of the highest privilege would be set aside by one not of the highest privilege. In other words, you would hold that the rules of the House supersede the Constitution, which I contend is not logical.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Committee on Rules having submitted this privileged rule, if any gentleman wishes to make a motion suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas, that can be brought before the House by voting down the rule.

Mr. WINGO. The only desire I have is for orderly procedure. Would not that be doing in an indirect way what we might do directly; would it not be a better parliamentary procedure, and be safer, and resolve all doubts in favor of the construction of the Constitution to pass first on the veto? Frankly, I should vote against passing it over the President's veto, but I think we ought to go very carefully and be sure to carry out the constitutional mandate. Would it not be a quicker procedure to pass on the President's veto and then if we override the President's veto that settles it. If the House fails to do that, the Rules Committee can bring in this rule and make the new bill in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes that there is much merit in what the gentleman says, but the Chair thinks that this accomplishes the very purpose the gentleman himself says he desires, and that is that the President's veto shall not be overruled. This motion accomplishes the same end without calling for a vote on the President's veto. It simply eliminates one step in the proceeding. It seems to the Chair that this is the quicker way to accomplish that very end. It may have been that when the President's veto was up it would have been better that the House should have voted upon it, but then if the House had failed to sustain the President's veto it would have gone to the committee and then come back just as it comes in now. That was not done; the original bill is not before the House, but is in committee. It seems to the Chair that while that might have been a more orderly manner, yet this has precedents and support and accomplishes the same end and eliminates one step.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEWALT. Is not this an attempt to sustain the President's veto by the action of the committee in reporting a bill consonant with the President's views instead of either sustaining the veto by a vote of the House or rejecting it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In case the rule is defeated, what is the method of procedure for securing a vote on the presidential veto?

The SPEAKER. The committee could report it out or the House could discharge the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations having had referred to them the sundry civil appropriation bill with the President's veto, took the President's veto as final on that bill, and asked the Committee on Rules for a rule for the consideration of a new bill providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the ensuing year, and this resolution is to make that bill in order. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina how much time he desires on the rule.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I suggest 20 minutes on a side. I have had some requests for time that I did not have when I first spoke to the gentleman about this.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the rule be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by myself and 20 minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by himself and 20 minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make a further request for unanimous consent that at the end of the 40 minutes the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question on this proposition. The rule as brought in by the Committee on Rules provides for two hours of general debate, one half of that time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the other half by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Did the Committee on Rules take into consideration the fairness and equity of that, in view of the situation and the conflict of opinion, and consider at all the question of allowing any of that time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Education, which committee is primarily interested in this proposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Education is a member of the Committee on Rules and was present when this rule was considered. He then made no suggestion other than the usual suggestion as to the division of time between the majority and the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving further the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he would consider the propriety of himself offering an amendment

to the rule giving those who may be opposed to the amendment brought in by the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to control at least a part of this time? We have no assurance, in view of the language of the rule, that those of us who may desire to oppose the amendment will be given any consideration whatever in this debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the gentleman from Alabama, I would say that it has been customary in cases of this kind for both the minority and majority members of the committee having the bill in charge to yield time to any Member of the House who may be especially interested in the measure under consideration, either for or against, and I assume that that arrangement can readily be made in this case.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the statement about no request being made in the Committee on Rules, I recognized the usual custom of the two sides of the aisle being given the control of the time, and the equity that is always shown to Members who are for or against the bill under consideration. For that reason I took it for granted that there would be no advantage taken on either side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is always the assumption in the Committee on Rules that there will be a fair division of time between those opposing and those favoring the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. The only bill to be considered now is the new bill that has been introduced?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That bill is not printed so that the Members of the House may have access to it or have a copy of it, and I submit the point of order to the Speaker that it should be out of order to consider legislation when the membership of the House has not had the privilege of seeing a copy of the legislation which we are to consider.

The SPEAKER. It may be that perhaps it would be well that that should be in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it in order to object to the consideration of this until the bill is printed?

The SPEAKER. It is not. Perhaps it should be, but it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not printed, and we can not get a copy of it.

Mr. CANNON. This rule settles it. That is what the rule is for.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I notice in the reading of the rule that there was no number given the bill under consideration. Is it necessary that a number be given to the bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The number will be given by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reported the bill as H. R. 7343.

Mr. GARD. I did not hear it reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has brought in this rule for the consideration of the bill, providing for the reading of the bill without amendments, except germane amendments to the provision providing for the educational rehabilitation of our returned soldiers. This is the only unusual feature of this rule. We justify ourselves before the House for that unusual provision of the rule by the fact that the House has recently considered the sundry civil appropriation bill in its entirety as it is contained in the bill made in order by this rule, with the exception of the provision to which amendments are made in order. Otherwise the rule is not unusual. We made this provision in order to expedite the passage of this very important measure. The activities of the Government are practically suspended. Many of the activities of the Government that are now under operation are in operation in violation of law, and it is a very serious question whether or not the action taken by many of the departments of the Government within the last few days will not be entirely unlawful and so declared by the courts if the question be raised. It is for the purpose of making ample provision for the rehabilitation of our disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines and provision for the operation of the Government that we are anxious to expedite the passage of this bill, and therefore we bring this rule in as now provided.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, the President vetoed the sundry civil appropriation bill because of the inadequacy of the appropriation to continue the great work of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. In response to the veto of the President the Committee on Appropriations held supplemental hearings and has reported legislation the consideration of which is provided for by the rule which the House is now considering. As this was a unanimous report from the Committee on Appropriations, I imagine that the objections set forth in the President's veto have been satisfied. This vocational education should not be made the subject of too rigid economy. The work of this board is something of which every American ought to be proud. [Applause.] These wounded soldiers should be liberally dealt with. Every one of them should have \$100 a month while he is being educated. Those with families should receive more. If this legislation does not satisfy the objection raised by the President's veto, I imagine that we will hear from the President again. Inasmuch as this is a unanimous report and inasmuch as the officers of the Federal Board for Vocational Education have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, let us hope that this legislation is such that this board can continue its benign work to the end that every one of these wounded soldiers may be given an education such as he prefers by the Government of the United States at governmental expense. [Applause.] I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 17 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the rule.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House in its anxiety to proceed will not set a precedent that may rise to plague us in the future. The committee has reported a new bill, and it frankly admits this is a new bill, and bringing in this rule has admitted it is not a question of privilege, and it is accompanied by the remarkable statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I desire the House to consider that statement when it comes to vote on this rule. As I now recall the statement—and if I do not quote the gentleman correctly he can correct me—he said that the Committee on Appropriations treated the veto of the President as final. By what authority does any committee of this House treat a veto of the President as final?

Under the Constitution it is made our duty to determine whether a veto of the President is final, and the only jurisdiction—the gentleman will find precedents, although I have not time now to call attention to them—the only jurisdiction the Committee on Appropriations had was to make recommendations to the House whether or not it should sustain the President's veto. Now, the orderly procedure for this House to do and for the committee to have done would have been to have reported back the vetoed bill, not the new bill, but reported back the vetoed bill with recommendation to the House as to whether or not it would advise the House to sustain or reject the President's veto. That is the orderly procedure, gentlemen. If you do not adopt that procedure, you will find yourself coming to this conclusion, that the rules of the House—

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question? I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. WINGO. Let me finish my statement. I repeat, if we follow the present proposed procedure, if you let the statement of the gentleman from Kansas go as final as the action of this House that the committee, and not the House, under the Constitution shall determine whether or not the veto of the President is final, you establish a dangerous precedent, and you establish that the rules of this House are superior to the Constitution. The only people who can treat the veto of the President as final is the Congress through solemn proceeding. You must act upon a roll call. Suppose we adopt this procedure to-day and pass this new bill. This House will never carry out the constitutional mandate to pass upon a President's veto. What will happen? I imagine from the reading of this text that the gentlemen are going to get around one of the objections of the President. I am not prepared to say now whether I shall vote to do that. I will be frank to say that I am strongly tempted to do that. As I heard the reading of the proposed amendment they propose to get around one of the objections of the President by changing the limitation. In other words, the House then will by a majority vote override the President's veto and put up to him a second time that which the President has vetoed once. Gentlemen, we can not afford to do that. I am in sympathy with the President's veto. We all want to get quick action. Now, let us vote down this rule. And I shall move, if I can get recognition, to discharge the committee from further consideration. Then call the roll and I will vote to sustain the veto of the President. Then there will be no objection made to the

unanimous consent for the gentleman from Iowa to bring in the new bill, but if there is objection, then the Committee on Rules can make it in order and the House can preserve an orderly procedure.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the rule is this: When a veto message of the President is submitted that any Member of the House has the right to refer that message with the bill to the proper committee, and any other Member of the House who is in favor of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's veto has perfect right to offer a motion to pass the bill notwithstanding the veto, but if no Member—

Mr. WINGO. I think the House has acted properly in line with the precedents. It can refer any question to a committee for recommendation. The House by its procedure referred the veto message to the committee for its recommendation, and that committee ought to come back to this House with the recommendation that it either sustain or vote down the recommendation of the President. If we sustain the veto, then we can bring in a new rule and preserve the constitutional procedure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall not permit the observation of the gentleman from Arkansas to pass without notice. The gentleman is very much exercised because the veto of the President was not challenged by the Members of the House and voted upon. There was an opportunity for that vote when the message arrived and was submitted to the House.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When I conclude the statement. The House observed the practice that has been in vogue for more than a century and that was observed within the past two years in this House. The President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, on the 22d day of August, 1916, vetoed a public land bill. That bill, together with the veto, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and those two measures, the bill and the veto, still lie slumbering in the Committee on Public Lands without a vote or any action whatever on the part of the House on the veto.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And the gentleman from Arkansas, I believe, was a member of that committee.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Just as soon as I refer to another bill and veto.

Mr. WINGO. My question was on the other matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman think it sufficient answer to say that a former Congress failing to obey a constitutional mandate to go on record on a presidential veto justifies this Congress doing it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the former Congress observed the law and the rules of the House in the action it took.

Mr. WINGO. If we take this procedure to-day, will the gentleman tell me what will become of the President's veto?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Exactly the same thing that became of the President's veto on the Army appropriation bill. On August 18, 1916, that bill, together with the veto message of the President, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and four days later a bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs making appropriation for the Army and passed the House without a record vote. The gentleman from Arkansas was then a Member of the House.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is reciting past history. I am asking what will happen now? Will we ever have a vote on the President's veto under the Constitution if we follow your procedure?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; no more than we had a vote on the veto when the President vetoed the Army bill and the land bill in 1916. If the House had decided to challenge the veto of the President on the Army appropriation bill of 1916, the vote would have been taken immediately by roll call. If the House had desired to challenge the veto message of the President on the land bill, it would have done so by a record vote immediately upon the veto message being laid before the House together with the bill. In this case the House Committee on Appropriations has accepted, and the House is about to accept, the veto message of the President as final so far as the sundry civil bill is concerned, and is reporting out a new bill, according to precedent, providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the next year.

Mr. WINGO. The Chair ruled otherwise to what the gentleman has stated. Objection was made the other day and the Chair overruled the gentleman's objection and insisted, over

The objection of the gentleman from Kentucky, that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] had a right to move to refer it to the committee. So it was challenged at that time, and the Chair ruled, and very properly, that we had a right to ask for a recommendation of our committee before we acted on the veto of the President.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The House acted entirely within its rights in referring the bill and the message to the Committee on Appropriations. We could have voted down that motion. Then the vote would have been taken on the veto message of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, of course I think it is a real recognized fact that this whole procedure is just simply a subterfuge of the majority side of the House to keep from going to direct vote on the President's veto message.

Now, I do not blame my friends on the other side of the House very much for trying to "duck" this issue, to use a slang expression. Our friends in the majority, in preparing legislation to take care of wounded and disabled soldiers, evidently did not take proper precaution in the way of appropriations to do that. The President called the attention of the country and of the House to the fact that the majority had been negligent in that regard. And I believe it was upon yesterday that the Republican House sustained a veto of the President. Naturally the majority does not want to get into the daily habit of having the Republican majority on the floor of the House sustaining the vetoes of the President. It is a fact that this whole procedure, the Committee on Rules coming in here with a rule to-day, is almost exactly what the President demands; but the orderly procedure, as pointed out by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], would have been much better. It would have been a more manly way to have met the situation to have disposed of the veto message and then come in with a rule and then with the bill and have passed it in the regular way.

Of course, the gentlemen on that side are responsible for the legislation. I am sorry that they did not measure up to the requirements when they had an opportunity to provide sufficient money to take care of disabled soldiers.

It devolved upon the Democratic President to use the great power of the veto to bring the majority side to its senses. And, of course, I congratulate my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his ingenuity and wisdom in mapping out a course that will prevent his side from going to record on a fair show on a roll call, as practically every man on that side would vote to sustain President Wilson on this veto. I think the country is familiar with the situation, but I simply wanted to emphasize the fact and call the attention of the public to the way in which they are undertaking to get around and not meet the issue.

It is a well-known fact that every man in the military and naval service of the country and their friends should bear in mind that if it had not been for the veto power exercised by President Wilson the Republican Party would not have given the soldiers and sailors the recourse to which they are entitled. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The Democratic House of Representatives passed the sundry civil bill and it went to the Senate. It did not become a law.

Mr. UPSHAW. Why?

Mr. CANNON. That bill made no more favorable disposition for vocational education than does this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Claptrap! Claptrap! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that the Senate had no chance to pass upon the bill because of a filibuster by the Republican Senators, who not only killed this bill but many other bills, which required an extra session of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. But if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. A Democratic Congress, in February or early in March, passed a sundry civil bill with a less provision than is contained in the bill we passed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CANTRILL. Just a moment. May I have one minute more?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTRILL. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAYTON. Just one question.

Mr. CANTRILL. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] I will state that a Democratic House did pass all the requirements demanded by the department at that time when the bill was under consideration. The demands are much larger now than they were then.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement, I am sure. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he is mistaken about that. The estimates made for this service in the regular Book of Estimates were for \$4,000,000, and the only appropriation made by the last Congress for this purpose, a Democratic Congress, was \$2,000,000. This Congress has already appropriated \$6,000,000 for this purpose, and this bill carries \$8,000,000 more. Those are the facts in the case. Post up! Get the facts! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANTRILL. These differences could easily have been worked out between the two Houses if the filibuster had not occurred. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Post up! Post up! [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has 15 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How many more speeches has the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. POU. One speech of five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I wish the gentleman from North Carolina would use his time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I care nothing at all about the question as to whether this vocational bill as now proposed to be amended was passed by the House and failed in the Senate, nor do I care what the provisions are, so far as the amount in the bill is concerned, because that is water that has passed by the mill. The question before us, and to my mind the important question, is an orderly manner of proceeding, and with due deference to the decision of the Speaker I maintain that this rule being now considered is not in order.

Now, what are my reasons therefor? In the first place, I do not think anyone will contradict the basic proposition that when a bill is vetoed by the President of the United States it must be returned to the House in which it originated, with the veto message, and immediately thereafter it shall be considered and a vote is to be taken as to whether the bill shall pass, notwithstanding the objections thereto. That, as the ex-Speaker, Mr. CLARK, has already said, has been construed to mean that the consideration can be postponed even indefinitely.

Now, what has been done here? When this veto message came into the House with the bill attached thereto it was by the House referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, what does the Committee on Appropriations do? It comes back to the House with what? With a new bill, not with the old bill, not with the bill which was to be voted upon and determined upon as to whether it should be passed by a two-thirds vote, notwithstanding the objections of the President, but with an entirely new bill, so far as we know. Therefore I maintain that, although it is said that this new bill is in consonance with the objections of the President of the United States, it is sustaining the veto of the President by the action of a committee, and when that committee reports the bill to the House the House can vote upon it, and by a majority vote determine that the sustenance of the veto by the President shall be maintained.

Now, that is clearly, if there be anything of force in the language of the Constitution, a violation of the provisions of the Constitution. It deprives the House of voting by a two-thirds vote on the veto message, and gives the right to the House to affirm that message or negative that message by a majority vote. If you get beyond that, you get beyond the Constitution itself. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the use of poison gas in warfare was first undertaken by the Huns at the beginning of the Great War. It has never so far received the sanction of the civilized world. But there seems to be a disposition in certain quarters to adapt those tactics to legislative discussion, and so we have a variety of gas explosions here this morning in regard to a matter that is as clear as any feature of the procedure of the House of Representatives. Gentlemen attempt to establish smoke barrages, behind which they hope to conceal their real partisan purpose and intent.

Now, the fact is that there are three motions that can be made when the President returns a bill with his veto—a motion to consider forthwith, a motion to postpone to a day certain, and a motion to refer to committee. And all those motions have been made from time to time since the foundation of the Government, and this is the first time, so far as I know, that anyone has ever raised a question in regard to the validity of any of them.

If the gentlemen on the other side who are agonizing because the House did not do the perfectly senseless thing of voting on a veto message relative to a provision which it expected to amend, practically in accordance with the recommendations of the President, had felt that way when the matter first came before us, they could have either made the motion for immediate consideration or they could have voted down the motion to refer to the committee. They did not even ask for a division. So far as the RECORD shows, the action of the House was unanimous, as I recall it, on the motion to refer to committee—a motion very frequently made; a motion made on that side within the last two years with regard to a great supply bill providing for the Army of the Union. It went to the committee, and exactly the same practice was followed as was followed in that case, when my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], was in the chair as Speaker, and when a great majority of the men now sitting on that side were here as Representatives in the former Congress, as has been followed in this case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What was done with the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. It was taken up for consideration, and it was considered, just as this bill will be considered. The only reason why any rule is necessary in this case is to expedite the consideration of this bill. We happen to be operating under another rule, which makes it difficult to get in even with a privileged bill from the Committee on Appropriations. Furthermore, this bill has not been printed, and therefore could not be considered until to-morrow without a rule. Therefore, in order to serve the public interest and have this bill reenacted as soon as possible, it has been necessary to bring in a rule; and the minority members of the Committee on Rules used very good judgment and patriotism in the Committee on Rules by voting for the rule, as they have shown their very poor judgment since the rule was reported. They have proceeded to argue now for the first time the new and strange heresy propounded by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, 21 Members seconded the demand.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-one Members, not a sufficient number.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the other side. Those opposed to taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety in the negative. Twenty-one is not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The resolution is agreed to, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has one hour, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], has one hour. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are about to consider a bill providing for the sundry civil expenses of the Government in lieu of a similar bill vetoed by the President. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], will make a statement with regard to the details of the paragraph toward which the presidential veto was leveled. I do not propose to discuss that matter in detail, but propose to discuss for a very few moments the general question of this particular veto.

The sundry civil bill was signed by the presiding officers of the two Houses on the 1st day of July. The President did not act upon it until the 11th, by the veto, which arrived here on the morning of the 12th. He vetoed the bill on the ground that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation was not sufficient, and that there were certain limitations contained in that item upon the amount which might be paid for high salaries, which he claimed would hamper the work of rehabilitation under the paragraph.

We are none of us challenging the President's constitutional right to veto legislation. It is not only his right to do it, but it is his duty to do it when he feels justified in taking that extraordinary action. But so far as my experience goes, this is the most extraordinary and unusual presidential veto we have ever had. There may have been presidential vetoes in the past on the ground that a certain item of appropriation was not sufficient, where the right to create a deficiency was unquestioned, but I do not recall any such veto, and I doubt if there ever has been such a veto up to this time.

There may have been presidential vetoes in the past on the ground that Congress was not providing for salaries sufficiently high, but if there have been I do not recall them. I do not know of a case, have not been able to find a case, where a President has vetoed a bill on the ground that the Congress has not provided large enough salaries. These are the two grounds of the veto before us. If the bill had not been vetoed, no one has any doubt but that the work of vocational rehabilitation would have been carried on in the largest possible and most liberal way, because every dollar of the \$6,000,000 carried in the bill was available for use as soon as it was needed and when it was needed.

The right to create a deficiency was unquestioned, and if the \$6,000,000 had been needed within a month or two months or three months it could have been used, and Congress would have responded promptly and willingly to any request for a deficiency appropriation to carry on the work. It is true that with regard to these gentlemen whose salaries were about to be reduced they might have been temporarily separated from the public crib and pay roll, some of them, or their salaries of \$5,000 and \$4,000 and \$3,500 might have been reduced somewhat, temporarily at least, until such time as the President might have communicated with the Congress, calling attention to the necessity, as he saw it, if he did see it, to increase the salaries of these officials. No President, so far as I recall, has ever vetoed an appropriation bill because of the alleged insufficiency of an item where a deficiency could be legally created, and no President, so far as I know, has ever heretofore vetoed a bill on the ground that the salaries provided were not high enough.

If it be true that this appropriation is not sufficient for the entire fiscal year, that matter would have been provided for by a deficiency appropriation. If it be true that some of these gentlemen are entitled to \$5,000 instead of \$4,000, or to \$3,500 rather than the \$800 or \$1,000 or \$1,200 that they used to earn in their usual vocations, that fact could have been presented to Congress without the veto of a great supply bill. During the period of the Great War we passed Army and Navy bills that carried but a fraction of the sums needed and used for military and naval purposes, but were any of those bills ever vetoed on the ground that the appropriation was not great enough? The ordinary appropriation bills carried hundreds of millions of dollars. The deficiency appropriations for this same service carried tens of billions of dollars. The President must know and the President does know that through a deficiency appropriation all needed funds would have been provided for, without the extraordinary action of vetoing this tremendously important supply bill.

This Congress in 37 working days passed through both Houses, securing the signing by the presiding officers of the

two Houses, seven great bills that had failed in the preceding Congress. The President was not at the seat of government and could not sign them, and from the 1st of July up to the time action was finally taken on these bills practically every activity of the Federal Government was in dire jeopardy lest something might occur to prevent the enactment of these bills into law. Until the President acted, the multiplied activities provided for under this bill, from Panama to Hawaii, from the Arctic to the Virgin Islands, were in questionable circumstances, and still all these activities would have been validated had the President signed the bill.

But when he failed to sign it, these activities, wide flung as are our possessions on land and sea, involving the employment of hundreds of thousands of people, in the most important services under the flag, were left without legal sanction, and to-day so far as they have operated from the 1st of July have been operating without warrant or sanction of law, a condition which has never existed under our flag from the foundation of the Government to this time.

What are some of these activities? The Panama Canal and all of the work on and in and about it; the activities of the Alien Property Custodian; the maintenance of all the Federal penitentiaries; the Coast and Geodetic Survey; the Coast Guard; the Emergency Fleet Corporation as provided for in this bill; the Federal Trade Commission; the great work of flood control along the Mississippi and on the Sacramento Rivers; the activities of the Geological Survey and the Lighthouse Service; many of the most important activities of the Bureau of Labor; all of the activities of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; the National Park Service and all of the wide-flung public-land services; the Reclamation Service; the work on rivers and harbors as provided for in this bill and on public buildings from one end of the country to the other; the maintenance of St. Elizabeths Hospital, where 4,000 of our unfortunate boys are being cared for; and the maintenance of soldiers' homes throughout the country.

By reason of the veto of this bill all of these activities, so far as they are being carried on, are now absolutely without any warrant of law so far as employments are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. This bill carries an appropriation of \$53,000,000 for military and naval family allowances of soldiers; \$75,000,000 for military and naval compensation of soldiers and their families. Not a dollar of these sums can now be legally paid. Not a dollar of them has been paid legally so far as it has been paid since the 1st of July. But in order that the Congress may have its attention called to the salaries of a few gentlemen who do not want to be separated from the public crib, in order that the attention of the country might be called to the fact that there is a possibility of a deficiency six or eight months from now in one item, all of these great appropriations for our soldiers and our sailors, their wives, widows, and orphans, are nullified, held up, deprived of legal sanction.

Why, even the flunkies at the doors of the White House are employed, and have been since the 1st of July, by reason of this veto without warrant of law. If there is anybody being paid there now he is being paid contrary to law and employed contrary to law.

If the Panama Canal is carrying commerce to-day it is doing it without legal sanction for expenditures. If they are taking seals at the Pribilof Islands they are doing it without warrant of law. If they are surveying lands for settlement they are doing it without warrant of law. If they are paying the widows and orphans of soldiers and the crippled soldiers themselves they are doing it without warrant of law.

I would regret to express on the floor of this House my honest opinion as to the motives, purposes, and intent of this absolutely unnecessary and unjustifiable veto of a great appropriation bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Tying up the activities of the country everywhere for the alleged cure of something that is curable, if it needs cure, through the ordinary processes of the Government and without recourse to this revolutionary procedure. If the President had been at the seat of government when this bill was passed and had wanted to veto it, it might have been done without creating this condition of chaos and confusion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is cheered by his side of the House when he says that it is an unnecessary veto. Why did not the gentleman move to pass it over the President's veto? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If it is such a clear case as the

gentleman says it is, and wholly unnecessary, why did not the gentleman give us the opportunity to pass it over the veto?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Texas is a very shrewd, smart, astute gentleman, and he does not believe in this veto any more than I do. In his heart of hearts he knows there is such a thing as taking advantage of an opportunity to appear to be doing something for folks when you are not doing it. That is the answer to his question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] would have been a very good speech opposing this veto, but it comes too late. The trouble is that the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House who passed this bill originally over our insistence to increase the appropriation to rehabilitate our crippled soldiers did not want to toe the mark and vote on the question of the veto, because the President's veto is right and proper. That is all there is to this hullabaloo here to-day; merely that and nothing more.

I am more in favor of this veto than I have been of any veto message the President ever sent to this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am in favor of doing everything possible for the comfort and prosperity of the American soldiers, especially those who are wounded or crippled in battle. There was nothing secret about this thing. This is not the first time that a message was ever referred to a committee, but the case that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] cited is not parallel to this. That message that he was talking about was referred to the Committee on Public Lands for the purpose of killing it in the committee. Nobody had any idea of killing this veto, and it ought to have been put on its passage and those who were in favor of it given a chance to vote to uphold the veto.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What was the reason for referring the President's veto of the Army appropriation bill in 1916?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not remember. There are lots of things that I do not carry about in my head.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In that case the veto message, together with the bill vetoed, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and four days later a new bill was reported back and passed without a roll call.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true. I do not remember the circumstances of the case.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is a parallel of this case.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The principal part of the speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is a whine against the President of the United States. His objection or criticism divides itself into two parts. The first is that the President went to Europe and the second that he vetoed the bill. I am going to give my opinion about both matters. The President of the United States had as much right to go to Europe as he had to go to Baltimore. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I said that from the start. There had grown up in this country the delusion that the President of the United States could not go outside of the country, and when President Taft and Gen. Diaz met on the bridge at El Paso, and each one stood on his own side of the fence and they had some kind of a confabulation down there—that performance confirmed that delusion in the minds of the American people. The gentleman from Kansas has a bill or a resolution or something of the sort providing that no President of the United States shall leave this country. I suggest to him that he is locking the barn after the horse has gone. [Laughter.] No other President except President Wilson ever went to Europe or anywhere else outside of the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And never will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Maybe never will, but that resolution or bill—which is it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. A bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of the gentleman from Kansas is not intended to be passed. It is intended to be an indirect assault on Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me tell you something that I remember that happened some years ago. When I think of it it makes me wonder that the gentleman from Kansas did not bring in a resolution censuring Woodrow Wilson for leaving the United States, because he, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, when Col. Roosevelt was in the very zenith of his power and fame, had the courage to stand up here on the floor of the House and take President Roosevelt's hide off in pieces as big as a saddle skirt, and when he got through

with that speech I told him that if it were proper for Congress to do so, if Congress had any jurisdiction over the case at all, I would be glad to move that Marshall Ney's name be stricken out of history as the bravest of the brave and the name of the gentleman from Kansas inserted in its place. [Laughter and applause.] Why did not the gentleman live up to the reputation for courage that I have given him? I do not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I waited until the President's return from his mission to Europe.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you what you want, every one of you over on the Republican side. You want to find some kind of fault with the President of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I not suggest to the gentleman that the President is making it very easy for us to do so?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; he is not. You are entirely mistaken. The President of the United States has more power than any man on the face of the green earth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Too much—too much!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Perhaps he has too much; but he has it. That is the main fact. While you Republicans have a majority of 43 in the House and a majority of 2 in the Senate, still you lack a good deal of having the coin of vantage in the political fight that you are precipitating in this House from day to day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have not always agreed with President Wilson, and I never do agree with everything that any man who ever lived does, and never will. Men with brains in their heads and courage in their hearts do not have to agree with any particular man about everything that he does and everything that he asks. [Applause.] When I have differed with him I have come out into the open and fought like a man, taking all the slander, lies, and filth which editors, hoping for some reward, could heap on me. I have not siddled in and siddled out as the gentleman from Wyoming and his followers are doing to-day. When I think he is right I propose to support him, tooth and nail. I shall give him the benefit of the doubt every time as to whether he is right or wrong. If he is palpably wrong, I shall fight him or any other man that ever sits in the White House. Certainly the great Republican Party does not propose to reduce itself simply to a concentrated growl. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That is exactly what you are all doing. The whole speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was nothing but a growl, and he is getting to be the greatest growler on the American continent, bar none. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Anybody can find fault. That is one of the easiest performances known among men. Any plug can go out with an ordinary telescope and find spots on the sun. They are there; they have always been and always will be, but notwithstanding the spots the sun continues to warm and light and fructify the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can talk all you please about spots upon the present President of the United States, but notwithstanding the fact stands forth that by the verdict of the civilized world he is the foremost man in all the world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me an additional five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman from Missouri five minutes additional.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not hear what the gentleman from Georgia said.

Mr. UPSHAW. It was just a friendly question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is friendly, all right. I did not start out to pass any eulogy on President Wilson. He needs none. Like Daniel Webster said about Massachusetts, "There she stands and you can judge for yourselves," and there is not a man in the House who has any respect for his own reputation, both for intelligence and veracity, not a single one, who will deny that by the universal suffrage of America he stands at the top of the heap. Now, if any of you want to deny it I will stop long enough to hear you deny it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, about this veto. Of course, it is sidetracked by the committee, and we will never get a chance to vote on it now. I have great respect for the Speaker, but I think he ruled wrong; but that does not make any difference here or there. What we want to do, and I believe the Republicans, the bulk of them, want to do toward this particular proposition, is to give all the money that is needed to take care of and educate these wounded soldiers. [Applause.] And as far as I am individually concerned, I thank God the President vetoed that bill. [Loud applause.] I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to yield some time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when we had up for consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the sundry civil appropriation bill carrying an item of \$4,000,000 for the purpose of administering the powers of the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation of wounded soldiers I had a rather earnest colloquy with some of the members of the Committee on Appropriations upon the assertion made by me, and vouchsafed for by other members of the Committee on Education, that the amount carried in the bill, especially as reported back by the conferees after an agreement with the conferees on the part of the Senate, was totally inadequate for the emergent need of that great organization, and I challenged the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the committee, at that time to state categorically whether or not he was in a position to assert that in view of the testimony before his committee up to that date he was willing to give to the House the assurance that the sum of \$6,000,000 finally agreed upon, in view of all the appropriations, was ample for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the amendment to section 1 of the original act and also the general administrative purposes of the board as provided for in the original act.

I asserted then that it was impossible for those figures to come up to the necessities of the situation, for the reason that a few days prior to that occasion this House by unanimous vote had passed a law amending section 2 of the original act by the terms of which law the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation took over under their exclusive jurisdiction from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance at that time approximately 4,000 additional soldiers, making a sum total in anticipation of their immediately giving at that time something over 7,000 men. It was then, as it is now, gentlemen of the committee, a mere matter of mathematics, based upon the pay of \$80 a month for single men and \$100 for married men, to establish that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 carried by that act amending section 2 was only sufficient for the purposes of that amendment, and it did not make any provision whatever for all the other general expenses of the board at that time.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My time is limited; ask a brief question.

Mr. DEWALT. Are there not practically now 14,000 instead of 7,000? Is not the pay increased from \$80 to \$85 for single men and to \$115 for married men?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was coming to that, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. Gentlemen, when we passed this original bill creating this great department of our Government, a new adventure in the history of our Republic, we did not imagine the great scope that it was going to take, we did not imagine the great area, so to speak, of the beneficence of this legislation, and we did not reasonably anticipate the great number of wounded and disabled men who would come under its provisions. At that time it was estimated that the maximum number of all of our wounded and disabled who would come under the provisions of the bill for all time would be 10,000 men, and up to this date, gentlemen of the committee, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], and, as carried out by the testimony before the committee, they already at this date have under their control, or will have very soon, for vocational rehabilitation practically 14,000 wounded and disabled soldiers, and at the rate of \$100 a month, an average for 14,000 men, it is simply another matter of mathematics for you to see that this appropriation of \$12,000,000 we are providing for here by this amendment is not going to be sufficient to carry out the purposes of this great law, and that hereafter this board will have to come back to Congress for additional appropriations. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the leader of the Republican Party upon this floor, made a vigorous criticism of the President of the United States for sending in this veto; but, gentlemen, I submit for your consideration that the contention of those of us here upon this floor when this matter was up that this money is needed—as a justification and vindication of the righteousness and justice and humanity of the President of the United States action in vetoing this appropriation—is the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has brought in a bill sustaining his position as to the amount required, and very largely liberalizing the restrictions upon the amount of salaries to be paid.

But, gentlemen, in its real essence and analysis this is not a partisan question, and I think it is rather to be regretted that

any element of partisanship should come into discussion of this great proposition. These wounded and disabled soldiers are the wards of this great Nation until they have received fully and completely the benefits of this legislation, and every Member of this House is, in his duty here, a trustee of their interest, and upon a fair and legitimate presentation of the fact showing their necessities, called upon to vote every dollar, not in a stingy, miserly way, but, upon the contrary, in a generous and, I am almost tempted to say, an extravagant manner if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like two more minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield two more minutes to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Gentlemen, I think it unfortunate that the restriction upon the salaries should have been fixed. I believe sincerely in the integrity, and not only the integrity but in the wisdom and ability and honesty of those men who are administering this great law. I have no personal interest in any of them. None of them, I believe, comes from my section of the country at all. But they have been men called into the service in this emergency in this great cause, many of them against their real will. Take the case of Dr. Prosser, the director, and he is still, as a matter of fact, superintendent of that great Dunwiddle Institute, out in Minnesota, and it is only by the courtesy of the board of trustees of that institution that his services are temporarily assigned to the Government of the United States. They talk about his salary. He was getting, as president of that institution, the sum of \$10,000 per annum, his salary from the Government. If you will make an investigation, you will find that there are a number of these other men who are selected for their capacity, for their excellence of knowledge upon these questions that necessarily go into consideration in making them capable of administering this law, and that they are men who in private avocations and pursuits earn equally as large amounts of salary as those they are now paid.

Under the limitation of time I can not discuss the provisions of this amendment minutely. I rejoice in the interest, at least in the temporary interest, in the wounded and disabled and handicapped and stricken young men of this Republic, who have become so in the service of the flag. Because we stood up here and pleaded in their behalf the other day, we rejoice in the President's veto, which, as indicated by the report brought in by the committee, has resulted in doubling the amount, and we trust will suffice for a large part of the fiscal year to carry out the necessity of caring for those soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, first I want to pay my respects and compliments to the Committee on Appropriations. I believe it realized that it made an error and that it has tried to correct it. I do not think that a discussion whether the request for the appropriation was made in a certain form, or how it was made, enters here. I do not think that any action that has been taken up to this time has any particular weight; that is, such action as is against the bill.

It seems to me it reduces itself to this simple proposition: This great Government of ours, by this Congress in its enactment, has decided that it is going to rehabilitate the soldiers. It is a problem, a definite problem, and with it there are certain avenues and elements. What are they? You are either going to carry out and solve that problem for the benefit of these men and, secondarily, for the benefit of our country, or you are going to put a quietus on it. My opinion is that you are going to solve it.

Now, what is the problem? To-day there are 5,200 crippled men in training. What does that mean? It means that those 5,200 men will be employed, or engaged in receiving that training, for an average of 10 months. Does it cost anything for the training? Yes. How much? The tuition is \$17 a month, and by reason of an amendment of the second section of the war-risk insurance act there was transferred an appropriation and a duty and a function which belonged to the War Risk Insurance Board, to the Vocational Board, and made a law here, which said that during the training period of these crippled men they must be supported.

The bill brought in here asked for \$75, but this House in its discretion and judgment, which I think wise, enacted a law, which has been signed by the President and is now on the statute books, which gives to the single man \$80 and gives to the married man \$100 a month, plus his tuition of \$17 a month, and, for 10 months' training at \$117 a month, for a year it totals \$1,400. Plus that \$117 a month to the married

man there is allowed by allotment \$15. If he perchance has one child, he is allowed \$10 additional. If he has two children, the second child is allowed \$7.50; if he has three children, \$5 for the third child, and \$5 for every succeeding child. The single man is allowed \$80 without dependents, but if he has dependents—and while it may seem a misnomer for a single man to have dependents, it is a fact that he has them—he is allowed for his parents \$10 each, and then a gradation down, for his brother, \$5, and it goes on down until it reaches his father-in-law. So you can see that the average, where there is a dependent of any of these men, goes from \$80 to \$117 a month. Twelve months' training equals \$1,400. Now, there are actually being trained 5,200 men. Multiply that number by \$1,400, and see what the total is. It will go considerably over \$6,000,000. When the appropriation was asked for by this board at the last time the sundry civil bill was being considered, it was approximated on this basis. Then the War Risk Insurance Board gave but \$35 for support during training, and they averaged \$40. There were 7,000 men then ascertained to need training. There were 3,000 actually in training. Four thousand of those men were waiting transfer from the War Risk Insurance Board to the Vocational Board, and your act in amending section 2 accomplished that. That was \$90—\$60 for support and \$30 was estimated during the training for tuition. Seven thousand multiplied by \$90 gives you what? It gives you \$6,300,000. The board came in and asked for \$6,000,000. At that time, my friends, there were but 3,000 actually in training, and this was estimated. What has transpired since? There are now awaiting survey and waiting for training 8,500 men. These men are to average \$100. Multiply that by the number—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. No; I have but little time. The gentleman is well prepared to take care of his part. We are friendly. I will state only facts.

Now, what has this country done? What is Canada doing? Canada has a problem, my friends, of 40 per cent less men in training than we have. We have nearly 14,000 men ready now.

There have been surveyed 98,000 men by this board. Canada, with her seven thousand and odd men in training, has appropriated \$32,000,000, and we have now ready for training approximately 14,000, and we are expected to do the physically impossible thing with but \$12,000,000 appropriated.

These funds, my friends, go only to the training and to the support of these crippled men during training. What are the expenses all of which are vital and necessary? There is the traveling expenses of disabled soldiers, emergency medical care, mechanical appliances, salaries and traveling expenses of employees, rent of district offices, equipment, printing, supplies, expert medical service, and communication. In fact, this \$12,000,000 will not provide for these and many other things the board is required to do in the registering, surveying, medical examination, training, and placement of disabled men.

Now, much has been said here about the staff of this organization. I want to be perfectly frank and honest. Each side of the House indulges in it—I do not know what you would call it; it may be politics or it may not be—but whatever it is it is mixed with insincerity, and it has no candor to it, and it does not stand the light of day if there is anything in the administration of this department which needs investigation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. DONOVAN. It is the fashion now to investigate everything, and if there is anything to which exception can be taken in the administration of this department let us investigate and let us not whitewash it or do an injustice. If we find anything wrong, do not stop with an elaborate report which leads nowhere, such as we heard here in regard to the National Security League, but let us seek an indictment. Let us see who these "terrible men" are, as has been suggested by innuendo. Are they broken down political hacks or not? What are the requirements for the work? Can you take a chauffeur out of a car and have him administer this department? Can you take a man out of a ditch and put him at it? My opinion, gained by observation and investigation, is that you must have trained executives.

I never heard of Dr. Prosser and never saw him until he came before our committee. He impressed me as a capable man. He is an educated man, president of a Minnesota col-

lege, an expert in this line, and a pioneer in the upbuilding of the disabled man; he is efficient, practical, earnest, and sincere. Sometimes these qualities are not all welded in a man of superlative education. Then there was Dr. Chandler. Who is he? He has been selected as the president of William and Mary College, and he was Dr. Prosser's assistant, giving his services at a nominal compensation for this most noble work. Who is Dr. Munroe? He is a prominent and successful Massachusetts business man. Who is Mr. McIntosh? He is a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, appointed with the then Cabinet members, with two other distinguished Americans, by the President of the United States.

Gentlemen, let us be honest with them. Do you mean to tell me these men are not men of the highest caliber? If they have surrounded themselves with a staff or a kitchen cabinet, unworthy of the exalted position which they occupy in the administration of their sacred trust, let us see at once the wrong is righted. But if they are such men as I describe, let those in this House that are unjust and unfair forever hereafter desist. We have a problem here, an earnest one, and I often think that the facts have not been sufficiently explained. I know that a Member of another body in this building made a reference in error that the Vocational Board had another appropriation of \$5,500,000 for the training of soldiers. It is a fact that there is such an item in the Army appropriation bill. It is for the training of soldiers, oh, yes; but not for these soldiers. It is not for the rehabilitation of disabled and crippled soldiers. It is for the normal soldier man. Our great Government made that an attraction to bring them into the Army, and then to make them mechanics and electricians and efficient in numerous branches of the arts and sciences.

In conclusion I want to say to you, gentlemen, that before the committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Education, there is pending a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the eradication of illiteracy, for the development of Americanization, for the developing of equal opportunities in this great country, and yet when this \$12,000,000 is asked for we hesitate and halt. I would vote \$150,000,000 for a proposition to give education and the retraining of men who are not educated and who answered the call of their country and went to battle and returned maimed and crippled, to take them off the human scrap heap, where they would otherwise be thrown as human derelicts or outcasts, and give them an opportunity of hope and spirit, again make them a worthy part of the Commonwealth, make them of advantage and value to their country and to themselves.

Nineteen million dollars is the lowest amount that this rehabilitation problem can be operated on for the present year, and the balance between \$12,000,000 and that sum will soon be demanded of your committee. I know that it and no other succeeding body of men is knowingly going to cripple this work when the appropriation for it is asked, or where it is asked, or what clothes a man wore when he asked it. It is a problem in this country, and every man here is for it, and will vote for the appropriation, and I say, "Go to it, and God bless you all for doing it." [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman [Mr. DONOVAN] who has just left the floor. We are all agreed, I am sure, on the general proposition under consideration. There is not a man here but wants to do everything that is necessary for the rehabilitation of these valiant men.

We should remember, however, as was suggested by the majority leader a while ago, that Congress is in session and will be in session, and that this is a matter where a deficit can be allowed, and where a deficiency bill can be brought in later. Any effort that may be made here to fasten upon anybody, either Democrat or Republican, a desire to appropriate too little for this great and worthy purpose I am sure is altogether unwarranted. I know that every man here feels, in the language of the great Master of men, that not one of us is worthy to stoop down and loose the shoe latches of one of these men who placed his life upon the altar of his country.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have a keen appreciation of the intelligence of the American soldier, and therefore I fear not from his judgment and understanding of this question any effort that may be made here to attempt to discredit anyone on this side of the House, because it seems that possibly not enough was appropriated for this great and worthy purpose.

The intelligent, efficient American soldier can detect a camouflaged political veto just as readily as any Member of this House.

They know that an additional appropriation could have been made within a week at any time, and would have been made, for this purpose. I do not think that the soldiers of this country, from the days of the Civil War down to the present, have any question in their minds as to who have been their friends, and who will provide amply for them at any time necessity requires. They will not discredit men in this House for seeking to keep down unnecessary appropriations on all lines when there is a deficit of from \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000 a day in the public Treasury, and when men in every line of industry are clamoring for a reduction of taxes. We are glad and anxious to do everything that is necessary, and we shall do everything that is required. I believe with those who have already expressed the same conviction on this floor that the exercise of the veto power at this time, holding up all these great appropriations and handicapping so many branches of the Government, was unwarranted, and that it would have been far wiser to approve this measure and trust to Congress to meet the deficit when it should occur.

Each Member here knows that this Congress will provide from time to time every dollar that is necessary for the full and effectual rehabilitation of every American soldier.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is one item in the amendment reported that I would like to have modified if it does what I am sure it does, and which I do not believe the committee intended it to do. It is that paragraph which says that no person except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act.

The words "or any other act" would cover the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act, and would exclude the present director of the Vocational Board of Education, who is not a member of the board.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that on Sunday the committee held a hearing, and it was stated in that hearing that the present director intended to resign his position, and that \$6,000 was all they were going to require for any salary, that that would be the limit, and that is one reason why the matter was carried as it is.

Mr. FESS. I regret to have that information, that Dr. Prosser is going to resign from this board. My acquaintance with him is of many years standing, and I know he came here at a great loss in salary. Until recently he received \$10,000 a year, and a change was made to cut it to \$7,500. Now, this cut to \$6,000 would, of course, lose him to us if he had not decided voluntarily to retire. I do not care to take any time to eulogize an individual. It is not a matter of legislation, and therefore I do nothing more than simply to express regret at the information I have just received, which is very sudden and surprising to me. I did not know that we were about to lose him.

The Vocational Board is embarrassed over the rapidly increasing demands for its work, that were not known when it began to work. For example, I have a letter which indicates that \$6,000,000 would be all that would be required for this work. That was written at a time when the soldiers had not yet returned from Europe in great numbers, and the amount of work was not well understood; but there are 5,200 soldiers now in training, and 8,500 more whose claims have been approved. That would make nearly 14,000 soldiers who are ready to take the training, and at a very conservative estimate it will go away beyond the amount that is here allowed. I am perfectly frank to state that the amount is beyond anything that I had in mind when I introduced the other bill.

Some are inclined to criticize, on the basis that the work is growing too rapidly. If there was no limit to this I would be in the same attitude of suspicion, but the growth is limited by the number of disabled soldiers, and I do not want to be a party to any legislation on the basis of economy that would deny training to any disabled soldier, no matter how many there are or how large the amount is. [Applause.] For that reason I desist from any criticism of the board for asking for the additional amount, and at the same time I share the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to hold it within reasonable bounds. But it is our business here, with the facts in mind, to act according to the latest intelligence that we have.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DENISON. I agree with what the gentleman has stated, and I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio had found anyone in this House who really differed with him on that proposition, and who was not willing to appropriate liberally or who wanted to economize especially for this line of activity.

Mr. FESS. I agree with my friend from Illinois that there is no disposition on the part of anyone to cut off the needed training. There has been some misunderstanding as to the facts. When we were considering the bill before, I confess that my mind was not entirely clear as to the magnitude of the demands of this work, and when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported that the sundry civil bill carried a certain amount, and indicated that it was a duplication, that statement immediately confused the minds of a good many of us. However, it is not a duplication. Our bill which passed the House the other day carried \$6,000,000. This is \$6,000,000 more, making \$12,000,000 in all for the use of this board, and that is not as much as the present demands would seem to indicate. That is, if we have 14,000 maimed soldiers ready for training, and would put them immediately in training, it will take more than the amount that is allowed. But I am perfectly willing to rest in the conviction that the Congress will meet that additional amount under an urgent deficiency bill if it is presented, and the facts are shown that it is needed. For that reason I am inclined to support the report of the chairman of the committee, with the full intention of doing everything in our power to take care immediately of those who are in need of training. With that statement, with a keen intensity of feeling of what we ought to do, I do not hesitate to vote for the bill as it has come before the House at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I stand for the man on crutches [applause] not because I happen to be on crutches myself, but because there is a pathos of appeal in any man who faces life with a handicap. If a crowd of newsboys on the street come to me to sell papers, the little fellow who is crippled gets the sale of even more than one if I happen to have the change.

I want to emphasize what was said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. If it be true that the highest salary to be paid to the man at the head of this vocational training has been reduced to only \$6,000, I am heartily in favor of increasing it. I believe that any man who is big enough and great enough to direct a work as great as this ought certainly to receive as much pay as any Member of this Congress. If Dr. Prosser, to whom such high tribute has just been paid by the gentleman from Ohio, was commanding \$10,000 a year as an expert before coming to this vocational training leadership, this Government ought not to expect such sacrifice of him. We owe our wounded soldier boys the best that money can buy.

We are inspired to do our best for these soldiers when we think of so many men and women who have fought their way through life with a handicap, and have been a blessing to the world. When we think of how the greatest history of Mexico was written by Prescott, a man who was blind; when we think of Alexander H. Stephens inspiring this House and ruling his State from the throne of his rolling chair; when we think of Joe F. Sullivan, of Arkansas and Michigan, brilliant editor of the Hospital School Journal and author of "The Unheard Cry," who can not walk a step; when we think of Fanny J. Crosby, blind from childhood, writing songs for the comfort of millions of hearts on earth, and which, I think, must be sung among the hosts of the redeemed; when we think of our honored colleague, Mr. SCHALL, of Minnesota, who leans on his staff and with sightless eyes catches visions of beauty and of patriotism that make him an inspiration to us all; and when we think of these brave spirits who were willing to give their all, who come back to us with armless sleeves or staggering on crutches or with sightless eyes, reaching their hands to the Nation for which they were ready to give their lives, I want to go on record, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as standing for everything, and perhaps a little more, that these brave boys need. When one faculty is lost the others are intensified, and it is wonderful and inspiring to contemplate how a man who has been maimed in body can have his remaining faculties developed in power and efficiency, but expert training is necessary to that development, and I stand unequivocally for this appropriation, and for anything else that may be necessary to help these brave heroes under handicap do their efficient best for themselves and for the Nation that loves them so well. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. DONOVAN had leave to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Wyoming saw fit in his remarks to criticize the President for having vetoed the sundry civil bill on account of the fact that it failed to carry what he considered a sufficient appropriation for the rehabilitation of the soldiers. And yet the gentleman from Wyoming, by his support of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations raising that ap-

proprietion, indicates his entire concurrence with the President in the fact that the former sundry civil bill failed to carry a sufficient amount for the rehabilitation of the soldiers. As has been suggested, entertaining the views expressed on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming, instead of asking that this bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, should have immediately asked the House to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto by the President. His support of an increased appropriation is in itself an indorsement of the veto of the President and entirely inconsistent with his recent remarks.

As a matter of fact, all of the public activities to which the gentleman from Wyoming refers, are being carried on at the present time. We know that there will absolutely be no hindrance or let-up in this work. It is true there is at the present time no appropriation for the maintenance, but everyone understands that this bill will become a law in a few days, and that there will be absolutely no embarrassment in any of these activities.

The statement has been made to the effect that under a Democratic House in February last only \$2,000,000 was appropriated for this identical purpose. The bill which passed the House in February carried an appropriation of \$2,000,000 and made available the \$2,000,000 that had theretofore been appropriated. It appeared at that time that the needs of the Vocational Board were only \$4,000,000.

I think the report of the committee was \$1,500,000 and the committee raised it on the floor of the House to \$2,000,000. There was no objection made on the part of anyone that that sum was insufficient, and so far as I know there was no objection on the part of the Vocational Board. The facts are that at that time, as it is now, the Vocational Board was not in a position to say just how much money they needed. A Member has only to read the hearings held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations last Sunday to ascertain that fact. As a matter of fact, when the Committee on Appropriations reported the bill at this session of Congress it reported an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Vocational Board, and that was all that they were asking under authority of law. It is true that they had sent a letter to the chairman of the committee, in which they indicated they might need \$8,500,000. But so far as I have been able to ascertain the Vocational Board, up to the 1st of June, believed that they would not need more than \$8,500,000.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Could not they have come in at any time before a succeeding Congress and got all they needed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But does the gentleman approve of that method of legislation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I do not. I do not approve of deficiency legislation except when absolutely necessary.

I think that Congress, when it can determine the facts, should appropriate every dollar that is necessary for the ensuing fiscal year, but here is a case where even the members in charge of the work, where even the members of the Vocational Board, are unable to give to Congress just how much they will need.

Mr. DENISON. Is it not a fact that in an emergency like war, or the conditions growing out of war, there are a great many activities as to which, as a matter of absolute necessity, under the circumstances there can be no accurate estimate made? For instance, like the Army or the Navy, or for this kind of a service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DENISON. And under those conditions the practical way to meet them is by a deficiency.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. My remarks as to want of information on the part of the Vocational Board are not intended as a criticism, because we all know that it is impossible for them now to say just how many disabled soldiers and sailors will apply for this training and will be entitled to it. Those are facts which must be developed as we go along. The point I was trying to make is this, that when this present sundry civil appropriation bill was reported to the House, the only estimate before the Committee on Appropriations was one for \$4,000,000, and when I refer to an estimate I refer to an estimate coming in the legal way, through the Secretary of the Treasury. As I said a moment ago, there was a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee which indicated they would need about two million and a half in addition to the sum carried in the bill, amending section 2 of the original act, which would make eight million and a half; and if that had been true then there could have been no injury done to this service by the passage of the sundry civil appropriation bill, which carried \$6,000,000. But a different state of facts was evidently presented to the President and also presented to the Committee on Appropriations last Sunday, showing that

they will need a great deal more than \$6,000,000. The fact of the matter is, from the statements made as to the number of men who are now in training, who have been accepted for training and who are expected to apply, I do not think the sum of \$12,000,000 will be anything like sufficient to carry on the work throughout the next fiscal year. I feel satisfied, however, that the sum of \$12,000,000 which is carried under this bill will be sufficient to carry them at least for six or eight months of the year, so that Congress will have ample opportunity at the next session to appropriate whatever is necessary. I do not believe there is a man on the floor of the House who would deny the disabled soldiers and sailors a single dollar that is necessary to provide them with the proper training under the law.

There may be some difference as to the limitation upon the question of salaries. There may be some who think there ought not to be any limitation and others who think that the salary limitation here is too liberal. This limitation authorizes the Vocational Board to spend, I think, something in the neighborhood of \$850,000 for salaries to persons who draw more than \$2,500 a year, and the lid is off, the sky is the roof, so far as the amount they may expend in salaries under \$2,500 is concerned.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Is it not \$941,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was the amount estimated by the Federal Vocational Board, but I think the committee's limitation has reduced it by about \$94,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I find the following in the language of the proviso:

That no persons (except members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum.

Was it the purpose of the committee in framing that proviso to restrict this limitation to the officials employed by the Federal Board for the Rehabilitation of Wounded Soldiers, or was it in the purview of the committee that this limitation should apply to salaries paid to the old existing Board of Vocational Training?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; the members of the board are especially excepted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean the employees of that other board.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was the purpose of the committee to limit any salary that may be paid in this service by the Federal Board to the sums set out in the amendment. The gentleman will recall that there are three or four employees, possibly, of the board now who are drawing salaries from two different sources. In my own judgment it is contrary to a provision of law carried in one of the naval appropriation bills, but I am informed that the Comptroller of the Treasury has passed on it and says that it is proper. Of course, to his decision we must bow, but the committee in recommending that provision to the House did so with the purpose of preventing any salaries being paid out of any other fund in order to supplement salaries set forth in this amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the specific proposition I want to clarify is whether this is intended under the salary limitation to embrace the employees of the original Vocational Board?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It applies to all of the employees.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And is not limited to those employed by the board under the act for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then it is new legislation restricting the salary basis of some men already on the roll of the Vocational Board?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that a former hearing developed that \$10,000 was being paid to one employee, \$5,000 from one fund and \$5,000 from another. The sundry civil bill which we passed fixed the maximum at \$7,500. The maximum salary under this amendment is \$6,000. That is in accordance with an understanding with the members of the Federal Vocational Board and was their own suggestion. They stated to the committee that they did not desire to pay anyone more than \$6,000 and not more than two persons at the rate of \$5,000.

Mr. MADDEN. The restriction intended by the limitation is to prevent some man who on the face of things is supposed to get \$5,000 from getting \$10,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. That is as it ought to be. A man ought not be permitted to be on more than one pay roll, and that is what this restriction means.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I have just made an examination as to how far this limitation will reach. There are 22 men now in the service under the Smith-Hughes Act who will be cut out if this remains

in the bill. There are 15 regional directors under that bill who get \$3,500 each. There are 2 assistants here in Washington who get \$4,000. These numbers that are specified here are limited to the rehabilitation of soldiers' activities. If this and any other act remain, it is going to disorganize the work under the Smith-Hughes vocational bill, and I think there was no effort to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no effort to disorganize any service, I will say to the gentleman; but if the gentleman will read this amendment he will find a most liberal provision as to salaries, more liberal, I venture to say, than any other act that has ever been passed through the Congress, and liberal because of the tremendous organization that has been built up by the Federal Board for Vocational Education. As a matter of fact, the facts show that they now have an organization amounting to \$3,488,000 per annum, and your committee felt and believe Congress will feel that it ought to keep its hand upon some of these salaries and put in a limitation which seems ample enough under all the circumstances. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. I do not believe my friend would say \$3,500 for a regional director was too much. There are 15 of them throughout the whole United States, and the gentleman would not say that that was an exorbitant price to pay them, and this bill will cut them out—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; this bill does not, I submit to the gentleman, cut them out.

Mr. FESS. Yes, it does; this bill does cut them out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill provides for 28 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each—

Mr. FESS. They are all employed under the soldiers' rehabilitation act.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But under this bill there are 28 in excess of \$3,500, 27 at \$3,500, which makes more than 50.

Mr. FESS. But it does not include the regional directors under the Smith-Hughes Act. That includes those employed under the soldiers' disability act. You are going to cut out those under the Smith-Hughes Act, and I do not think the committee wants to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say frankly to the gentleman that my own idea of this provision was to limit the amount of salaries, the number paid, and the amount that might be paid out of the funds provided in this bill and the act which passed the other day under the charge of the gentleman from Ohio, and not to affect any other service.

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman on that; but you are going back to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1918, which will cripple the service, and I do not think the committee wants to do that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee certainly has no idea of crippling the service. I say to the gentleman this provides for salaries of persons receiving over \$2,500, about \$850,000 in round numbers, and then, as I said awhile ago, they have absolutely unlimited authority to employ just as many as they please under \$2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Iowa begins speaking, I have something on my mind and I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to say that the salary roll that this board has accumulated amounts to about \$3,400,000 a year. Now, I would like to know how much money they spend—

Mr. GOOD. I will take that up. I will try to answer the gentleman before I have completed my statement, but I want to make a statement in a logical way.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I want to know the percentage of cost of management. If you are going to expend 25 per cent of all the money for salaries, there ought to be some restriction somewhere, I do not care whether it is for the soldiers or for anyone else. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not a fact that when the other bill was up from the Committee on Education that three motions were made on this side of the House to increase the monthly amount, two of which were unsuccessful and the third was successful, and that all three of those motions to increase the monthly allowance came from this side of the House? Is not that a fact?

Mr. GOOD. I have not given attention to that phase of the matter and do not recall, but if the gentleman was here and remembers what was done, I will take his statement for it. I want to say now at the outset I do not believe—

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will pardon me in this connection—

Mr. GOOD. I do not yield further just now.

Mr. FOSTER. It was by a vote of 62 to 57.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the public will or should look with approval upon any attempt from any source, I do not care how high that source may be, to drag in the mire of party politics the rehabilitation of our soldiers. The rights of the injured soldier are too sacred and our obligation therein is too great to think this should be done. [Applause on the Republican side.] I say without fear of successful contradiction that if the sundry civil bill as passed by the House in the last Congress had become law, only \$2,000,000 would have been available to rehabilitate the soldiers who were so unfortunate as to be wounded in this Great War. This Congress has already appropriated \$6,000,000 for the service and we are appropriating \$6,000,000 by this bill, or \$12,000,000, as opposed to \$2,000,000 in the last Congress. Now, let us get down to the solid facts and see just what we are talking about with regard to the veto of this measure. Under the law there never was sent to Congress but one estimate for this service for this fiscal year, and that was \$4,000,000. Subsequently, from the Committee on Education, there came a bill amending section 2 of the act carrying \$6,000,000 of appropriations, and that bill passed and has become the law, and every dollar of it is available for rehabilitation services.

The director, Dr. Prosser, on the 6th day of June, 1919, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in which he said that if the bill, coming with a favorable report from the Committee on Education, carrying \$6,000,000, should be adopted, then the estimate which he had made in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, increasing the regular estimate of \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000, could be reduced by \$3,500,000, which would leave available \$8,500,000 for the service. And until the President vetoed this bill there was never an intimation from anyone that the service would cost more than \$8,500,000 for the next year.

The gentleman, Dr. Prosser, who has been referred to as a very able man by Dr. Fess, made the statement when this measure was before the committee before that the total cost for the entire service for rehabilitating every man in the United States was \$13,502,200, and that it would require for the fiscal year \$6,000,000, or until the 30th day of June, 1920. You will find his table on page 19 of the report in the last hearings. It is as follows:

Total cost of work to be done (estimated).	
19,000 men trained for 10 months each, at average cost of \$655	\$12,455,000
27,360 men to be placed in employment, at \$20 each	547,200
60,000 additional men yet to be surveyed, at cost of \$10 per man	600,000
Total cost of work from June 27, 1918	13,602,200

The Federal Board of Vocational Education is composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Holden, Mr. McIntosh, and Mr. Munroe. I have no prejudice, and I am sure the other members of the subcommittee that heard the testimony both in this Congress and in the last Congress have no prejudice against any of these men or against the director, Dr. Prosser. The men were unknown to us. I never knew any of them, except the members of the Cabinet, and they have not appeared before the committee. But I say to you without regard to politics there was no division in the Committee on Appropriations, either in the last Congress or in this, with regard to the fact that there never was a body of men anywhere intrusted with a great work who seemed to know as little about the subject, who had as small a vision of the great work with which they were intrusted or were attempting to perform as this board to whom we have intrusted the rehabilitation of these boys who have been so unfortunate as to be wounded in this Great War. These boys that were wounded are entitled to rehabilitation under this act and have the tenderest sympathy of every Member of the House. [Applause.] And they should have the tenderest and deepest sympathy of every loyal and true American. And I believe they have. I have stated several times on the floor of the House that Congress would not and the country would not tolerate any cheeseparing with regard to this service. And if the President had signed this bill, and if the limitations were too rigid, if the money carried was found too little, he could have come before the committee or had some one else come before the committee, and within 48 hours he would have received a favorable report, lifting the limitation to the extent that the service would not be impaired. That has been the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, every member of it, without regard to the political parties to which those members belong, so far as I know.

The President says in his message on this subject:

Inasmuch as there are already over 4,000 disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines in training, and inasmuch as another 4,000 will be put in training now that the amendment to section 2 has become a law, it is clear that even at the rate of only \$80 a month, a sum approximating \$8,000,000 will be required for the support of these men.

Who told the President that? Mr. Munroe says it is not true. Mr. Munroe says he did not tell it, and he does not know who did tell the President. Eight thousand men? Four thousand in training, and 4,000 ready for training. Mr. Munroe testified within three days of the date the President wrote that message that instead of 4,000 in training there were 5,200. Instead of 4,000 more waiting there were 8,250 waiting. The President says 8,000. The vice president of this organization says there are almost 14,000. The President says it will take \$8,000,000 to pay for the subsistence and tuition of these men. The vice president of the board, within two days after the President's message, says that it would take \$18,000,000 to pay this cost. And yet the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] rises here and says that he supports this message. I do not know where the President got the information, but Mr. Munroe denies its correctness.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall, from the veto message of the President, that the \$8,000,000 will be used totally for subsistence?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, the gentleman is correct about that. That is what I have read.

Now, immediately after the passage of this law this man who has been so loudly praised by my very good friend, Dr. Fess, sent this message throughout the United States, for which I contend there is absolutely no warrant, and that it is at variance with the facts. His message was:

Under legislation just passed there must be drastic reduction of salaries unless, as we hope, some way can be found to prevent it. Therefore, withdraw immediately all forces from hospitals and other points of discharge and discontinue this service at once. Readjust your forces by releasing a number of men equal to the number so withdrawn. Retain the best qualified men. Inform all men remaining in the service who are receiving over \$2,500 that such excess can not be guaranteed after July 1. Urge all good men to stick by the disabled soldier to see if the matter can not be straightened out.

Notwithstanding that message, the bill that he referred to carried 52 places with salaries over \$2,500. Is it possible that a man violating the statutes of the United States that provide that no man shall receive two salaries, and this man so receiving two salaries, and is sending out such a false telegram, is the kind of a man to bring rehabilitation to those boys who were wounded in carrying the flag to glory? It ought not to be possible. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Munroe says that the cost per man was \$275. And my good friend—

Mr. MADDEN. Two hundred and seventy-five dollars for how long?

Mr. GOOD. For the complete training. Dr. Fess referred to that fact in his speech, I think, of February 24, in which he said:

The truth about the matter—

I am quoting now from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]—

The truth about the matter is, and I want to call attention to it just a minute, that it costs \$275, according to the estimate, to rehabilitate a soldier. Think of it! Two hundred and seventy-five dollars in taking a wounded man and putting him on his feet and making him self-supporting and self-respecting, so that he does not become a charge on the Government, but can look the world in the face and not feel that he is a pensioner, a subject of charity; and yet we educate in universities and under private management students at a cost of \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Now, Dr. Fess is one of the very ablest men on the floor of this House. It takes an expert of the kind referred to, I take it, in the President's message, to fool Dr. Fess. But Mr. Munroe and Dr. Prosser completely fooled him. What are the facts? According to the testimony of these men last Sunday, it will take, not \$275, but for subsistence and tuition alone \$1,400 for each man.

Mr. MADDEN. Does that \$1,400 include the salary of the men that spend this money each year?

Mr. GOOD. It does not. That is for maintenance and tuition. I have a letter here as to the men who are now employed and placed on the pay roll at salaries of \$2,500 and over per annum, showing that they will draw out of the Federal Treasury this next year on the present basis of employment \$941,000.

Ah, but that is not all. Gentlemen talk about the rehabilitation. This message pleads more for the rehabilitation of the college professor than it does for the soldiers of the United States. [Applause.] Why, this letter just written this morning by the board says:

In response to your telephonic request, I take pleasure in advising you that the pay rolls for personal services of persons employed in the administration of vocational rehabilitation act during the month of June, 1919, amounted to \$291,719.80. This amount multiplied by 12 equals \$3,488,537.60.

Remember that this is not to pay for teachers or the salary of the men who will train these men. This is the salary of the chair warmers—the men for whose rehabilitation the message pleads. And yet, according to the testimony of Dr. Prosser, this

great expert, it was only going to require about \$13,000,000 for three years to pay all of the expenses of the rehabilitation of every soldier who will come under the provisions of that very splendid law.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The \$13,000,000 was arrived at under the estimates of the old law, which permitted \$30 per month for subsistence, while the new law gives them \$80 a month, which is more than double.

Mr. GOOD. Well, the gentleman has not stated that exactly correct. The change was made from \$75 to \$80 a month, or an increase of \$5 per month, but there was, of course, an amount equal to \$35 a month transferred from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and now part paid by the board.

Mr. FESS. Originally it was \$30 a month that the disabled soldier got as subsistence, but now we make it \$80, and that makes the difference.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will as soon as I shall have concluded. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] will make a computation, he will find that the changes will not foot anything like \$1,400. I want to give the House these facts, and then I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. But these facts that I have are facts that the House ought to have.

Mr. GOOD. I will try to give the House the facts which I think it ought to have first. Then I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the House has no rights here.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it has. But no one has the right to take a man off the floor. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa refuses to yield.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Munroe, in making his statement to the committee, said that the Federal Board for Vocational Education never knew that there was a limitation as to salaries in this provision that was carried in the last bill. The bill that passed the House in February, carrying \$2,000,000, placed a limitation on the salaries that these people could receive, and that limitation was greater, and everybody in the House, irrespective of whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, voted for it. That limitation was greater than the limitation in the bill which the President vetoed, and yet Mr. Munroe and Mr. McIntosh came before the committee on Sunday last and said they never knew that limitation was in the bill.

Now, let us see whether they knew or not. On the 6th day of June Mr. Prosser addressed a letter to me as chairman of the committee, and in that letter he says:

The House Committee on Appropriations reported to the committee the whole lump appropriation of \$1,500,000 on motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation, and this amount was raised in the Committee of the Whole to \$2,000,000, and included in an item in the sundry civil bill as it passed the House.

Why, Dr. Prosser knew who made the motion increasing the amount from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000, and yet they came before us on Sunday last and said they did not know what was in the bill that they referred to in this letter, giving the amount that the bill carried and the name of the gentleman who made the motion. Mr. Munroe, who is vice chairman in charge of this matter, never made an estimate to Congress under the Secretary of the Treasury but for \$4,000,000 for this service for the next year. He wrote that letter saying that if the \$6,000,000 was granted in the educational bill all the additional amount that would be required was \$2,500,000, or \$8,500,000 in all. Then he withheld from Congress and the Committee on Appropriations all the information he had in regard to this service until last Sunday, when he came before the committee, and for the first time that human lips uttered the words, so far as I am advised, Mr. Munroe said it is going to take \$18,000,000 just to pay for the training and the tuition, and he thinks the total sum may amount to \$25,000,000. And no estimate even now for any additional amount.

Gentlemen, the estimate was made last October of \$4,000,000, when this country was at war, and every day the wires were flashing the news to various parts of the country, to the cities and to the hamlets and the towns, telling of some brave boy who was falling in battle; and it was at that time, when the list of wounded was growing day by day, that this great committee of experts said it would only cost \$4,000,000 for this year. And now, six months after the armistice was signed, they come in and think it may take \$25,000,000 for this service. But they do not know; that nobody knows. Now, it was on this showing that the committee reported out a bill carrying \$6,000,000 additional to the \$6,000,000 already appropriated, or \$12,000,000, which is ten millions more than was carried in the bill as it passed the House in the last Congress. It may not be enough, but if it is

not, all that will be necessary will be for the board to submit a new estimate and the money will be appropriated. There is absolutely no question about that. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the first reading of the bill was dispensed with under the rule. Was it not?

The CHAIRMAN. This is not the first reading of the bill. This is the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand there is no amendment but the new matter. I ask unanimous consent that the second reading of the bill be dispensed with, except as to the new matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would entertain the proposition, but, unfortunately, the House has already ruled that the bill shall be read. This committee can not change that rule by unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. When you get through with the paragraph, I would like recognition. Nobody knows when you finish a paragraph, because we have not a copy of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will request the Clerk to indicate when he reaches the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are in committee now, and notwithstanding the rule, it seems to me it would be in order for the committee to rise, if it sees proper so to do, and the House, notwithstanding any rule by unanimous consent, could omit the reading of this bill, which will take two or three or four hours, and which is not subject to amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. If the committee should rise, is it the ruling of the Chair that the House can not grant unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling that the Chair made was that the committee could not change the order of the House.

Mr. GOOD. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, except the provision on page 19 with respect to vocational rehabilitation, shall be considered as having been read, and that the further reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill, except the provision as to vocational rehabilitation, on page 19, be considered as having been read.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. GOOD. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 7343, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill, H. R. 7343, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to be notified when we reach the end of a paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, namely:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order that under the rule no motion or amendment is in order except to the provision on page 19 relating to vocational education.

Mr. MADDEN. I insist on a reading of the rule to see whether that is true or not.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I insist on having the rule read, so that I may see whether the point of order is well taken.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. That has been done under the rule. This is the second reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The first reading of the bill has already been dispensed with.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that the rule be read, to see whether the gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the rule provides that no amendment is in order except an amendment to the particular section referred to in the rule, on page 19.

Mr. BUTLER. You can not even move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if that rule provides that you can not amend any part of this bill except one part—

Mr. BUTLER. It does that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the rest of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Chair has already ruled that that can not be done in Committee of the Whole, the House having ordered otherwise.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the Chair hear me on that?

Mr. MADDEN. I object, Mr. Chairman, if necessary, so that there need be no discussion about it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I just want to say this—

Mr. WALSH. The point of order has been made—the objection has been made.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It does not make any difference if the objection has been made. I am arguing a point of order to the Chair, and the Chair has recognized me, and there is no force in this House that can take me off the floor under those circumstances.

Mr. WALSH. There is no point of order pending.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The point of order has been raised, and I asked to be heard on it, on the right to make a request for unanimous consent in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman started to argue a point of order that the Chair had already decided, but the Chair has the right to recognize the gentleman, and the Chair has done so.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The Chair has that right absolutely, and nobody can take me off my feet on that except the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the right to recognize the gentleman from Virginia, and has done so, on the point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what I wish to say in this connection is this: It is perfectly true that in Committee of the Whole we can not do anything by unanimous consent that would affect the procedure in the House, or usurp the power of the House by undertaking to give rights that are in excess of our authority, as for instance to give leave to extend remarks generally in the RECORD. The RECORD is not a committee publication. But with respect to proceedings in the Committee of the Whole, we may facilitate them by omitting by unanimous consent to do something that is not of the essence. Suppose we take such action. Who is there to gainsay us, and since we do not report the steps taken in the Committee of the Whole in detail, what evidence will there be when we return to the House of our unanimous consent proceeding? There is no rule of which I have any cognizance which undertakes to say that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole shall not put a request for unanimous consent, whatever it may be. There is no likelihood that mischief will result from action sought by unanimous consent, for the reason that one objection will reject the request. I have seen many things done in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent which were contrary to the provisions of some House rule, but the public business was expedited by this action. At times action is taken in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent, which at other times has been refused. For instance, I have seen the time for general debate which had been fixed in the House, extended by unanimous consent in Committee of the Whole. This request to dispense with this reading relates to us, to our authority, to our action, to our proceedings exclusively. To read this bill is pure formality that will accomplish nothing, save to waste our time. If by unanimous consent we omit that action, the validity of our report to the House and consequent disposition of the same, will be in no wise affected.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend, if the House adopts a rule for certain procedure in the consideration of a measure, that when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole the committee can abrogate that rule by a request to dispense with the reading if objection is made?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not if objection is made, certainly not. I am not contending for that proposition; but for the right on our part to facilitate our own proceedings in Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent. The time of general debate in the Committee of the Whole is primarily fixed in the House, but suppose after we get into Committee of the Whole, we agree amongst ourselves to debate generally for a longer period, how will that affect the validity of our ultimate action? What is the difference in substance between that action, and in beating the devil about the bush by taking up the bill under the five-minute rule and after reading a paragraph agree by unanimous consent that a Member shall proceed for an hour out of order? As I have stated I have seen general debate excluded by unanimous consent in the Committee of the Whole. Moreover I contend that that action was perfectly proper and parliamentary.

Do the Members of this body realize that most of our proceedings in the Committee of the Whole by unanimous consent are in contravention of some rule of the House, and there is no difference in authority and effect between a special rule for action on a given measure, and the general rules under which we may consider another bill. If by unanimous consent we can waive, or dispense with formal procedure imposed by the general rules upon proceedings in Committee of the Whole, we can dispense by like unanimity with provisions of the same character in a special rule under which we may chance to be operating. This it seems to me, must be a patent and unescapable conclusion.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman realizes that this is a pretty important bill, and I think the gentleman will agree that anything of the kind ought not to be done in the committee, but that we should go into the House to do it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the thing proposed to be done jeopardized in anywise this bill I would not suggest this action. Further if request was made for any action that would in any conceivable degree imperil the future of this measure, I would be the first to object to it, but I defy anyone to point out how, or in what way, if we dispense with the reading of this measure by unanimous consent, that fact will ever appear in the House when we report this bill with our conclusions. The bill would be taken up in the House for action on the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and disposed of in order. The regularity of that disposition would not be affected by the fact that we had saved several very precious hours for more important work than remaining in session for a reading to which no one would give the slightest attention.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Where the Committee of the Whole is required to perform a certain act, is it not within the power of the committee, by unanimous consent, to dispense with that act?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The Committee of the Whole, under the rule, must have the bill read, but it seems proper, by unanimous consent, to dispense with the reading.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; and it is the same as read when, by unanimous consent, it is agreed to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee can within certain limits control its own action, but the committee must act under the direction of the House when the House has directed the committee so to act. It is not within the power of the committee to vary it. The rule adopted provides that at the conclusion of general debate the bill shall be read. That is the rule for the committee to act upon, and there is no possibility of the committee changing that rule. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$6,000,000, of which sum not exceeding

\$15,000 may be expended for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia if space is not provided in Government-owned buildings by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided*, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this or any other act at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum and rates above that sum, except not to exceed the following: One at \$6,000, 2 at \$5,000 each, 28 in excess of \$3,500 and not in excess of \$4,000 each, 27 at \$3,500 each, 70 at \$3,000 each, 60 at \$2,750 each, and 100 at \$2,500 each.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the sum of \$6,000,000 and inserting \$8,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out the sum of \$6,000,000 and insert \$8,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, according to the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it seems that it will take anywhere from \$18,000,000 to \$25,000,000 to do the work of rehabilitating the wounded soldiers. And while he says that no estimate for more than \$4,000,000 was ever made in the regular way, in addition to that provided for in the act reported from the Committee on Education, yet he says that beyond any doubt it will take at least \$18,000,000. The proposal is to appropriate \$6,000,000, and that is in addition to the amount appropriated under the vocational act, which will make a total of \$12,000,000.

The President of the United States said in his veto message of this measure that not less than \$8,000,000 would be needed to meet the emergency that is now before us. I am for rehabilitating the soldier at whatever cost, and I am not for making the appropriation by piecemeal on the theory that we can meet the emergency in deficiency bills at some future time. I am in favor of appropriating money to meet the need now and not some other time. This is the time, and this is the hour, and there can be no excuse for reporting a bill with the same amount that has been rejected through the veto of the President. If it takes \$18,000,000, or mayhap \$25,000,000, to meet the needs of these men who come before us and say that \$12,000,000 is enough, let us appropriate that sum.

Complaint is made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that those in charge of the rehabilitation of these soldiers have been unable to say how many men would need rehabilitation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not now, thank you. We must all realize that no man living can tell how many men will need it until the war is over. No man living can tell how many of the wounded men would need rehabilitation until they have served a period of treatment in the hospitals in this country and in France. And as time goes by it will undoubtedly be proved beyond any question that more of these men will need that treatment, need the education, need the rehabilitation, for many of them are not going to be cured of what might in the beginning seem to be but a very slight wound.

And so I say that we have an obligation, a greater obligation than was ever imposed upon a legislative body in all the world, and that obligation is to see beyond question that whatever funds may be needed are supplied for the rehabilitation of these men.

They are unable to make a living for themselves; otherwise vocational education would not have been provided, and no man is permitted to enter this vocational educational institution except the men who must be reconstructed. And shall we say that a million or two million dollars is to stand in the way of reconstruction of men who gave their all for the flag, who buckled on their armor and went forth where battles raged to offer for the Nation's life the lifeblood of their hearts? Are we to say that the appropriation bill must carry six and not eight million dollars? Shall we stand upon the order of the amount? We have already expended \$51,500,000,000 for the war, and we have left 112,500 American boys buried on the fields of France, and I say the time has come when America, through its Congress, must speak, and now is the time to increase the appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCHANAN offers the following substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN:

Amend the bill by striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000," and add at the end of the provision after the word "each" the following provision, to wit: "And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have been sitting here and listening to Members discuss this subject, and everyone, without exception, has expressed unlimited sympathy with, and a perfect willingness to aid, those who have met with misfortunes in the war. I thought possibly this amendment would give them the opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they meant what they said, and extend to all who were injured in the war an opportunity to reap the benefits of the rehabilitation act and not have it limited to a few. Let me state a few facts from the hearings, and if any man believing these facts can escape from the conclusion that it will take \$18,000,000 or more, then I do not know what mathematics mean.

Mr. Munroe says, in round numbers, there are 14,000 men in training in this service now. It takes \$80 per month under the compensation law for each unmarried man, \$115 for a man with a wife, and \$125 for a man with a wife and one child, and so on up, according to the number of children he has, as provided by the compensation act. This makes an average of \$1,200 per year for each man in training. It takes \$200 a year for tuition for each man, which makes the amount \$1,400 a year per man for compensation and tuition alone. Multiply \$1,400 a year by 14,000 and you have over \$19,000,000. Escape it if you can. If you want to provide for these boys, you ought to appropriate the necessary money to accommodate all who apply. Be men and meet the issue; be not penny wise and pound foolish when making appropriations to be used for the benefit of those who on foreign fields upheld our flag so bravely and so gloriously.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If I understand the reading of the gentleman's amendment, he provides for \$12,000,000?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Twelve million dollars in this bill, and that, in addition to the \$6,000,000 appropriated the other day for this purpose in the vocational education act, making a total of \$18,000,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit, I wish he would tell us how he fixed the percentage of salary.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The way I fixed the percentage to be expended in salaries and the reason I did it is to keep the organization, if it be so inclined, from spending in the payment of salaried officers the appropriation we make for the benefit of the soldiers.

Under the bill as reported by the committee the board in control of the rehabilitation activities have unlimited power to employ an unlimited number of civilian employees at salaries between twenty-five and twenty-six hundred dollars each per year. I do not say that this board will abuse this discretion, but believe it the duty of Congress to throw sufficient safeguards around this appropriation to guarantee that the money we appropriate will be applied to the rehabilitation of the soldiers and not squandered in the payment of salaries to numberless civilian employees throughout the country.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But how does the gentleman arrive at the 18 per cent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I based it on the present salary basis of the board, and found that 18 per cent of the \$18,000,000 will give \$3,240,000 for salaries, which is, I believe, about the amount they are now paying in salaries, and I feel that more than one-sixth of an appropriation of this size ought to be sufficient for salaries of employees to conduct and supervise the operation of this institution.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does not that include operating expenses, office, and all that—general expenses?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it includes only salaries.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman appropriates \$18,000,000 altogether and then shows that it is necessary to expend \$3,000,000 and odd for salaries, he will be \$3,000,000 short.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly, but I figure that in this way: It usually takes about 10 months to train a soldier. That leaves \$200 per year to spare for each soldier. In other words, the \$1,400 is calculated for the full 12 months. It would take about 10 months on an average to train a soldier, which would leave \$200 per soldier to make up for extra expenses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Eighteen million dollars was figured on a 12-months' basis?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; but it does not take 12 months. It takes 10 months, although some may take more. I submit that proposition to the House, and I say that we should meet the issue and that we should not be penny wise and pound foolish. We should not be parsimonious with these soldiers; we should not run any chance of excluding even one single man whom it is

necessary to rehabilitate. It is the most sacred and the highest duty of this Government, as far as the resources of the Government will permit, to restore the impaired ability to earn a livelihood to each of our soldier boys who were injured in this war. Those boys who responded to their country's call, offered their lives for their country's sake, fearlessly invaded the gas-poisoned forests, held trenches against overwhelming odds, went over the top, and carried the tide of battle against the Hun at the point of the bayonet, and in so doing received serious wounds and material injury, which impaired their ability to earn a living. It is the duty of this Government to restore that impaired ability as far as it is humanly possible to do so, and any Member of Congress who fails to cheerfully respond to a generous discharge of this duty disgraces his high office and should be scourged from the House with a whip of scorpion tails.

But reverting again to the facts. There are 14,000 men whose applications have been approved for the rehabilitation training, and it will take over \$19,000,000 for maintenance and tuition alone to train these men. This makes no provision for medical attention, for car fare, and for administration work. This makes no provision for the thousands of other wounded soldiers who are daily applying for this training or no provision even for the examination and survey of other applicants who have been wounded and are seeking to be benefited by this law. There is an average of 150 wounded soldiers per day applying for this training, and this appropriation makes no provision for them.

If we mean what we profess and perform our duty to these boys who so gallantly and courageously served their country, we must act now and restore their impaired ability as far as it is within our power to do so, that life to them may be less burdensome and more pleasant. This is an undertaking that can not be postponed, and the statement that we can take care of them in a deficiency appropriation bill is misleading and hypocritical, as every Member of this House knows that the appropriation we make now will limit and confine the work and result in the exclusion of many wounded soldiers from the benefits of the rehabilitation act.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's idea is about right, and I am going to vote for his amendment, but does he think there is any danger of the President's vetoing it because we make it too much?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think not. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the President in his veto message said it would take \$8,000,000 alone for subsistence of only 8,000. Our figures show there are 14,000, and that they are coming in at the rate of 150 a day. Therefore, if anything, the appropriation is too small even if my amendment is adopted. I do not think the President will veto it, but I do think the President was right in vetoing the bill because this appropriation was too small. Instead of being criticized by Republicans in the House, he should be commended. He of all men realizes the duty of this Government to take care of the wounded boys, and he of all men will see that this Government does its duty toward these boys. If Congress does not make an adequate appropriation to take care of these wounded soldiers, I sincerely hope the President will veto the bill again.

Ah, gentlemen, if you will talk with some of these wounded soldiers who have come back, you will find that they went through hell itself for our country and its cause. If, therefore, they went through hell for us, we ought to be willing to go to hell for them. It is true, by their heroic action and victory they have "inscribed their lofty name a light, a landmark on the cliffs of fame," but they can not live on fame alone. We must therefore make adequate provision for their rehabilitation, as far as possible, and compensate them for their impaired abilities, to the end that no American soldier who was injured in this war shall ever feel humiliated, become a beggar on the streets, or become an inmate of a charitable institution. Unless adequate provision is made for them, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is it proper under the rules to amend this bill to increase the amount to be allowed for each individual's education?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not think there is any question about that. I think so.

Mr. DENISON. I think it ought to be a little bit more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to the fact that Mr. Munroe, the same man who made the statement the gentleman has quoted, on page 72, and Mr. McIntosh, also, states that it would cost approximately \$25,000,000

for the year, and Mr. Munroe said he thought probably that would not be enough. Of course, Mr. Munroe said he did not know anything about it.

Now, I think we ought to act upon this matter in a big way and in a way that will reflect credit upon the Members of this House. I do not believe there has ever been a time since this law was enacted when anybody wanted to deprive a single soldier of this rehabilitation service. Every Member of the House wants to grant every dollar necessary, but after all we must be careful in making these appropriations that we do not invite waste and extravagance all along the line. It is not alone in the payment of salaries that waste will take place. Now, in regard to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The gentleman says that the President asks for \$8,000,000, or rather stated in his message it would require \$8,000,000, and therefore he makes his amendment in that amount. Now, I call his attention to the fact there has been appropriated and is already available under the bill which passed the House and Senate and has been signed by the President, amending section 2 of the act, \$6,000,000 for this service. This bill carries \$6,000,000 for this service; the two bills carry, therefore, \$12,000,000. I do not know whether that will be sufficient or not. No man living knows whether it will be sufficient or not. Mr. Munroe, vice president of the board, when he was before the committee on Sunday, when he was asked the following questions by Mr. MAGEE, said:

Mr. MAGEE. The probability is that the average would not exceed 10,000. Do I understand you estimate the number at 20,000?

Mr. MUNROE. It may be 20,000. I do not know.

Mr. MAGEE. You do not know anything about it?

Mr. MUNROE. Nobody can foretell it; nobody knows.

Now, with this service in its infancy, with the desire on the part of Congress to give every dollar that is necessary, I ask the House to be sane and calm and to do that which is the businesslike thing to do; and if at any time there appears that the \$12,000,000 will not be sufficient it will take only 48 hours after the estimate has been made to the committee to report out a bill granting all that is required to supply the deficiency. I submit that is the orderly way to proceed—that is the way the business men of the country would have this Congress to proceed; it is the way these soldiers would have us proceed—and not proceed without any estimate before us except the wild statement of what it may cost. If you went on that kind of an estimate, if that side of the House wants to appropriate \$12,000,000, they ought to take the responsibility; but I believe this side of the House—that stands for economy, that stands for the elimination of waste [applause]—should say that, even when it comes to appropriating for the soldier, we propose to appropriate the money in a businesslike way—appropriate all that is necessary, but not millions upon millions upon the statement of a man who says, "I do not know how much it will take; no one knows." [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, may I have the attention of the membership for just a moment to see whether we have not some confusion here? The bill as passed from the Committee on Education carried \$6,000,000. The sundry civil appropriation bill provided \$6,000,000 in lieu of that \$6,000,000. That would have left \$6,000,000 for the administration of this work this year. The President asked for \$2,000,000 additional, which would have made \$8,000,000. The law providing \$6,000,000 is signed and the money is provided. This asks \$6,000,000 more, which is \$12,000,000, which is \$4,000,000 more than the President asks for, and if I am incorrect I should like to be corrected. That is my understanding after looking into it carefully. We are giving \$4,000,000 more than the President asked for in his message.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. MADDEN. Who said that?

Mr. FESS. I say it in view—

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody verify it? [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. I think I can verify it.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not mean to insinuate—

Mr. FESS. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the Committee on Appropriations will attempt to verify it.

Mr. GOOD. That is exactly a correct statement. The gentleman has stated the case correctly. The bill from the Committee on Education which passed carried \$6,000,000. If this bill passes in the form it is reported, it will carry \$6,000,000, or \$12,000,000 in all will be available.

Mr. FESS. In my time let me ask the chairman that if the bill as reported from his committee had been adopted and had become the law we would have had only \$6,000,000 for this service?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. FESS. Now we will have \$12,000,000. That means \$4,000,000 more than the President asked in his veto message, and that is the reason I am willing to support the matter which is before us.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will permit, is it not a fact that the President in his veto message referred to \$8,000,000 as covering only subsistence and did not therefore take into consideration the \$8,000,000 as covering tuition, travel allowance, medical staff, or administration or anything else?

Mr. FESS. If we had passed the bill under the instructions of the President we would have had \$8,000,000. As it is we are having \$12,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The President said \$8,000,000 would be needed for subsistence for 4,000 men. We are now presented with an entirely different statement for which we are appropriating not only for subsistence, for tuition, traveling allowance, and so forth, but for a larger number of men.

Mr. FESS. That is true. The fact still remains we are giving the soldiers \$4,000,000 more than the President asked for, and it seems to me it is a justifiable reason for passing it.

Mr. MADDEN. But not anything like we ought to appropriate.

Mr. FESS. That might be, but we can easily increase it when demanded.

Mr. DONOVAN. Assuming that to be a fact, of which I have some doubt, and from the gentleman's point of view possibly it is, is it not a fact that the problem which now confronts this board is that it will take a greater amount than \$12,000,000?

Mr. FESS. It probably will take more. I think that would be sufficiently cared for under a deficiency bill. But what I am trying to correct is the statement that this bill is not meeting the requirements of the veto message. It goes away beyond the requirement.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does not the President in his message say that this \$8,000,000 would only cover under the estimate what the instructors would draw in salary, and says specifically that there will be nothing left for the tuition?

Mr. FESS. Unless you gave the \$8,000,000 instead of the \$6,000,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Did he not say in his message that the \$8,000,000 would only pay for tuition and would leave nothing for the operation?

Mr. FESS. I still insist that the bill is going further than the President's suggestion in his veto message.

Mr. GOOD. The concluding paragraph of the President's message contains the following:

I therefore return the bill with the hope that the Congress will reconsider this section of the law, restore the \$6,000,000 appropriated under the act amending section 2, and most liberally revise the salary limitations, so that this beneficent work may go on, and go on at once.

And we went even further than that.

Mr. FESS. That would leave \$4,000,000 less than we now are granting. I speak in the most thorough sympathy with the efforts for rehabilitation, as every Member knows, and if the \$12,000,000 is not enough I shall be one of the first men to urge the committee to vote more. However, it seems to me that this is a very generous allotment from the standpoint of what heretofore was considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I want to see if we can not agree as to the time on this amendment and amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and all amendments thereto, as well as all other amendments as to the amount, be limited to 45 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that include the prohibition of offering an amendment to strike out the words "or any other act," as contained in the proviso?

Mr. GOOD. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, was I included in the schedule of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments

thereto, and all amendments fixing the amount contained in the paragraph, shall be limited to 45 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. GOOD. Then I move that all debate on that portion of the bill be limited to 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] moves that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto, and all amendments fixing the amount contained in the paragraph, be limited to 45 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. I thank the Chair.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] offered a substitute which I rise to support, and shall give my reasons for it. It is apparent from the hearings that it will take at least \$18,000,000. Understand me, I realize that every man on this floor, Democrat and Republican, has voted and will continue to vote to give the wounded soldiers every dollar that they may be entitled to. And all this political talk I do not take any stock in. [Applause.] We are all patriots here. The hearings show that \$4,000,000 was the proper amount at the time it was appropriated. The hearings show that \$6,000,000 was the sum needed when we came forward with the next appropriation, and the later hearings now show, since the veto, that it will require at least \$18,000,000. We understand that it will even take more than that. It is indicated in these hearings that there may be 98,000 of these wounded men. True, Congress can appropriate the money as the occasion arises. There is no intention on the part of any man on either side of this House to curtail that board and its activities. But there is one thing that I shall stand for, and that is a limitation on the salaries of these school-teachers and professors who are in charge of that work. I stand ready to vote every dollar that is necessary to properly teach these men and in order to take care of them and sustain them and pay their traveling expenses, but I believe that the American Congress should not allow salaries of \$10,000 and \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year to be given in the name of patriotism to some \$2,500 man to rehabilitate these soldiers and return them to practical life; and I shall vote accordingly, because I believe it is up to this Congress to in some way curtail the wild and extravagant expense that every man can see is going on in this country. [Applause.]

We are here to take care of the soldiers who fought for our country, and we should be here, and I am here, to prevent profiteers demanding enormous salaries as teachers for supposed patriotism, reaching down in the pockets of the taxpayers of this country in the name of the soldier. [Applause.] If we do not curtail the salaries that will be paid for these instructors, you will see them flocking from every quarter of this Republic to get to be instructors of these poor wounded soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. These men can be taught the necessary things to rehabilitate them and fix them for practical life by practical men on reasonable salaries. And when this Congress agrees that the salaries shall be \$5,000, \$6,000, and \$2,500, it seems to me that we ought to stand pat and say that we have some common sense and know what a man's services are worth when engaging in such business.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. I have only a short time.

The salaries of the Army officers are fixed by Congress; the salaries of all Government officials are fixed by Congress. Why should not this Congress fix the limitation on the men who are to instruct these soldiers? We fix the amount that one of these wounded soldiers is to receive for compensation and to support and maintain him. I desire to see the wounded soldiers get all the benefit of this appropriation, instead of a large part of it being wasted in extravagant salaries for those in charge of the vocational training.

Why not fix the salaries of the men who shall be charged with the responsibility of instructing them? It is the duty of the representatives of the people to stand for the protection and the safeguarding of the taxpayers of this country at the same time that we are upholding the rights of the soldiers and endeavoring to give them that to which they are entitled under every phase of the circumstances and conditions which now surround them. If we are to legislate in the light of past events, we must realize that before we get through with the wounded soldiers our bills are to go up to \$100,000,000 for this splendid purpose instead of \$18,000,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair will recognize next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I take it that all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and all of the Members of the House realize the desire of the country for economy in expenditures, and I take it that we all realize also that while that is the desire of the country it is likewise the desire that such economy shall not be secured under any circumstances at the expense of the soldier, and particularly at the expense of those soldiers who by reason of their services and their disabilities require education and rehabilitation. So the question before us is not one involving a difference of feeling as to the treatment to be given those men, but as to the adoption of the method best calculated to secure to those soldiers and sailors in the fullest degree and most effective manner the assistance which they have earned.

Now, there are those of us who from contact with the Vocational Education Board and the study of the hearings have come to fear that the disgrace and the scandal which have come upon the administration of our relations with the soldiers and their families in connection with the War Risk Insurance Bureau, which during the war by inefficiency of management in thousands of cases denied to the dependents of the boys and withheld from them the money and the aid which Congress voted them, will be repeated in connection with this Vocational Education Board. And that regardless of the amount of money you place in the hands of that board, the only way to secure desired results with the present constitution of that board is for Congress to keep as firm a grip as possible on the situation. In other words, instead of giving unlimited amounts of money to them blindly, simply because one member of that irresponsible board gets up and gives a wild guess—instead of giving them unlimited lumps of money on that ground we should give them the money we are satisfied they must have, and then later on, when the situation develops more clearly and the need is well established, if more is needed give it to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that board has never yet been able to tell the Committee on Appropriations definitely and tangibly how much they want. More than that, that board does not know to-day what it is doing. They can not tell you to-day what they did yesterday. They can not tell to-day where their offices were yesterday, or where they are to-day.

The city of Detroit is a large city. You might think that a board intrusted with unlimited funds of Government money would be able to tell whether they had in the city of Detroit an office in operation or not; but they appear not to. At any rate, they give out the most contradictory and conflicting statements.

I have here a letter stating that a Michigan soldier, wounded at Chateau-Thierry July 20, 1918, who went to Detroit July 9 to arrange to secure the benefits of vocational training and on arrival there was met with the information that the Detroit office of the board had been closed and that to secure the attention necessary for his enrollment he would have to go to Chicago. That experience being called to the attention of the board in this city the board, through its superintendent of advisement and training, Mr. W. I. Hamilton, wrote a letter to the brother of the soldier acknowledging, in effect, the closing of the Detroit office, saying in substance "the office is closed and you will have to go to Chicago, but we will pay the money to send you to Chicago." That letter was written from the general offices here by a high officer, and a high salaried officer, July 12.

And yet Dr. Prosser, the director of this board, on July 10, one day after the wounded soldier found the office doors barred against him in Detroit, and two days before Mr. Hamilton's letter giving reasons blaming Congress for the closing, gave direct, positive assurance to my colleague, Mr. NICHOLS, who had vigorously brought the matter to his attention, positive assurance that the Detroit office of the board would not be closed. He furthermore on that occasion informed my colleague "that there never has been any intention to close the office and no orders have been sent to close it." To make assurance doubly sure, I am advised, Dr. Prosser called the Chicago office of the board, the district office, by telephone and was informed by the officer in charge there that no such orders had been sent to Detroit from Chicago.

In other words, the office which the wounded soldier found closed on July 9 and was July 12 declared by Mr. Hamilton, superintendent of advisement and training, to have been closed because of the action of Congress, that same office, it was July 10 declared by the director and by the district vocational officer to be then open, never to have been closed, and not intended to be closed.

Such diametrically opposing announcements convict the board of either gross incapacity with resulting confusion in their work or of deliberate insincerity, manifested in deceiving the country to the intended prejudice of Congress. In either case,

from such a board, from such management, the interests of the soldiers must suffer. Flinging millions into their care means extravagance and waste. We must act through the agency the administration has named, but we need not follow their ill-considered guesses not supported by proper showing. Every dollar for which proper expenditure can be shown should and will be voted. But to double and quadruple in appropriation any request made, either to us or to the President, is reckless, dangerous, and unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think it is a very unfortunate matter that such an important subject should be discussed in Congress with nothing injected into it but politics. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] talks about the scandal in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the scandal in other things, and investigations on this and that subject—matters which have no relation whatever to the question of the rehabilitation of these crippled soldiers. If the gentleman and his party keep on investigating and spending money as they have started in their administration of the affairs of this House, the paramount issue in the next Congress will be the investigation of the expenditures of their investigating committees.

The purpose for which I rose mainly was to correct the impression that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] made as to the interpretation of the President's veto of this bill. He said in his statement that the President only asked for \$8,000,000. I want for the benefit of the House to read exactly what the President did say in regard to this appropriation, in the Record of July 12, in the first column on page 2493. He said:

The section of the bill which I now return, which governs the appropriation for this work, provides the sum of \$6,000,000 for all the expenses of rehabilitation, including the support of the disabled men in training, and this sum is stated to be "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918." Inasmuch as there are already over 4,000 disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines in training, and inasmuch as another 4,000 will be put into training now that the amendment to section 2 has become law, it is clear that even at the rate of only \$80 a month a sum approximating \$8,000,000 will be required for the mere support of these men, and that under the present appropriation nothing will be available for their tuition and travel or for placing them where they can earn a living, and it will be impossible to meet the needs of the new thousands who are every week seeking the benefits of the rehabilitation act.

Instead of asking for only \$8,000,000, he is stating affirmatively that \$8,000,000 will cover only the amount that they allowed, basing it upon \$80 a month, for their support. If there is any duty that we owe to those who risked their lives to serve their country, and who came out of the service wounded and maimed, it is to rehabilitate them as much as human brains and human genius can do it. We ought to have the best rehabilitation hospitals of any country in the world, and to give these unfortunate men the benefits of all the brains and all the training and all the advantages that money can buy; and, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to giving it to them in piecemeals, a few million dollars to-day and a few million dollars more to-morrow. [Applause.] In other words, I am opposed to compelling this Bureau of Vocational Education to come back here every few months begging Congress to appropriate a few million dollars more. The statements of the people in charge of this bureau, who ought to know, are that it is going to cost at least from \$18,000,000 to \$25,000,000. If these soldiers are to be rehabilitated they ought to be rehabilitated now, and they ought not to have to wait, and the machinery of this work ought not to be paralyzed on account of insufficient appropriations while they come back here and ask for additional money. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] provides for \$12,000,000 more in addition to the \$6,000,000 already appropriated in the bill from the Committee on Education here a week or two ago, which makes \$18,000,000. When these gentlemen who have charge of it say that it will take at least \$18,000,000, if we are going to give it to them, why not give it to them now and let the soldiers receive the benefit of it? Because the evidence shows

that these men are coming forward and taking advantage of this opportunity by the thousands, and there is no more worthy, eleemosynary institution in the world than this rehabilitation service and these hospitals for these maimed and disabled soldiers, and we ought to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and not make piecemeal of it.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the Members of the House that as a member of the subcommittee that made the recommendation to the full Committee on Appropriations, which was adopted by the full committee this morning, I attended the extensive hearing given to those representing the Federal Board of Vocational Education. We gave them what in our judgment will be a liberal amount at least for the balance of this year.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman say that the committee have given them all that it will cost for this fiscal year?

Mr. MAGEE. I will say to the gentleman that nobody can tell that, but refer the gentleman to page 24 of the hearings—

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman willing to admit that there are 14,000 of these men who are now ready for training?

Mr. MAGEE. There are 5,200 now in training, according to the hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. And how many are there waiting?

Mr. MAGEE. As I recall there are some seven or eight thousand more waiting.

Mr. MADDEN. Waiting?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And it will cost \$1,400 per year per man, will it not?

Mr. MAGEE. Nobody can tell what it will cost.

Mr. MADDEN. So that it will cost \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000 anyway?

Mr. MAGEE. I will call the attention of the gentleman to page 24 of the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I can not yield. I am referring to the statements in the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to something that is not in the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE. This is what Mr. Holder says:

Mr. HOLDER. We are going through the same experience as an insurance company or a growing concern, and we have not been in business long enough to quote from experience, so that it is impossible to answer your question positively, as much as we would like to do so.

Mr. MAGEE. That is what I thought. What I had in mind was this: In the first place, that you must be supplied with moneys to meet all reasonable needs. Everybody concedes that. Now then, if an appropriation should be made that is not sufficient for the purpose, Congress at any time, I am sure, would willingly respond and give you additional moneys. It seems to me we ought to try to work together, and work together along those lines. I do not like the intimation being thrown out that the Members of Congress are not willing to vote to give all the moneys that are reasonably necessary or all the moneys that may be required to fulfill these purposes. I do not like that. It seems to me no spirit of that sort should exist, and any talk or intimation of that sort is the cheapest kind of claptrap, political claptrap, you might call it. I do not like that, and I do not think it is warranted. I think we ought to get down to some reasonable basis, if we can, with the understanding that the men who are carrying on this great work will get all the moneys they will require for the purpose. That is my judgment about it.

Now, if you will turn to page 73 of the hearings you will find there further suggestions along this line.

Mr. MAGEE. You do not know anything about it?

Mr. MUNROE. Nobody can foretell it; nobody knows.

Mr. MAGEE. It is a matter of guesswork?

Mr. MUNROE. Absolutely.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAGEE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman know how many men there are in hospitals who have not made application yet for the rehabilitation training?

Mr. MAGEE. The number is estimated in the hearings.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will tell the gentleman. It is between 50,000 and 100,000.

Mr. MAGEE. We should not appropriate any greater amount of money than is reasonably necessary to enable the Federal Board for Vocational Education to carry on this work. I think it will be apparent to any Member of the House who reads these hearings that we ought to retain some control of these salaries and put some limitation upon them. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair and of the committee in granting me time when I have already spoken once.

As I stated earlier to-day, the problem which confronts us here is a definite, ascertainable problem, and it has its solution. There are gentlemen here who embark in oratory and flights of fancy and who waive us aside, but the fact is that

there are a definite number of men now in training and ready for training. There are 13,757 men, or substantially 14,000 men. Last month there were submitted for training 150 men a day. This month, in July, there have been approved for training 76 men a day. The Committee on Appropriations say that the right amount can not be definitely arrived at by computation. Now, gentlemen criticize the Board for Vocational Training. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] said—I do not know what the adjective was he used, but it was not complimentary, it was undeserved and unfair; but do these men on the Appropriations Committee, does the chairman with his vast knowledge of minute and infinitesimal things pertaining to the departments in the Government—does the gentleman know how much this is to cost? He does not pretend to make a prophecy. Where are you going to get the tangible figures to approximate, if you want to be generous and fair? You are going to the Vocational Board for the estimate. In the next six months, from indications now available, there will be 14,136 men plus 13,000 men now in training. It is simply a matter of mathematical computation—multiply 14,136 by \$1,400 a year for training and subsistence and you have the answer. This country last year paid \$222,000,000 for pensions. You know that this will alleviate and reduce pensions relative to the World War.

Another point overlooked by the Appropriations Committee is that they gave to the War Risk Insurance Bureau an appropriation of \$8,800,000 for the support of these same men. Now, this is nothing but a marshaling of funds from the War Risk Insurance under section 2 and placing it with the Vocational Board for Education and Training. Do not lose sight of that fact, and if you do adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, for \$12,000,000 in addition to the \$6,000,000, you are then only giving a part of what is actually needed to successfully carry on the great work.

Are you going to give these needed funds in piecemeal? When the Appropriations Committee recommends \$6,000,000 do they do it out of any generosity of the heart? Why did they send for the board to get an estimate if they could get any better sort of one? Why bother with this tyrannical incompetent board of vocational educators? Why did the committee send for them? They took advantage of the board's requirement as stated, and they lopped off \$2,000,000 from the \$6,000,000 requested. Do you want to continue that? It is a problem of mathematics and very elementary. There is no man here whether he is educated or not—it is elementary, it is a problem of mathematical progression. The money is needed to maintain this project and you must give it or wipe out the whole system. I trust that the House will adopt the Buchanan amendment because it is the nearest amount to meet the financial requirement for the work to be done, and if you do it you will be doing only partial justice. You will then be giving only \$18,000,000 as against \$222,000,000 which is given in pensions for the past wars of our Nation.

This is not to continue indefinitely. It is presumed that it will terminate in three years. Last month there came to this country 365,000 men demobilized, and among those were a great list of casualties. There is no man, there is not any human being, who can tell absolutely how many of these men will come for this training. By reason of your act here in increasing the allowance for support during training from \$75 to \$80 and \$100, you have made it more attractive to the soldiers. They came home from overseas and many of them went immediately to their homes. Now, you have made it attractive by increasing the amount so they can decently support their families while they themselves are away at training. They have had their home welcome. They are now coming back in great numbers to report for training and it thus increases this work. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when the President left this country to return to France, just after the adjournment of the last Congress, he made a public statement in which he criticized the action of the Senate in failing to pass some of the largest supply bills, and called attention particularly to the failure of Congress to pass the appropriation for the Railroad Administration. He pointed out how critical was the financial condition of the Railroad Administration, but he made no mention of the failure to pass the bill containing the provision for the Board for Vocational Education.

Now, when the new appropriation bill for the Railroad Administration came before Congress last month the estimate was for \$1,200,000,000, if I remember right. The Director General said that amount was necessary. The appropriation that was carried in the bill was only \$750,000,000, or \$450,000,000 less than the amount estimated by the Railroad Administration as actu-

ally necessary for the railroads. And yet the President approved that bill and signed it, without any protest or complaint.

I am unable to reconcile his action in approving that bill, which was \$450,000,000 short of the amount estimated to be absolutely necessary, with his action in returning this bill with a veto simply because he thought it was somewhat less than the amount estimated to be necessary.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. BEE. Does not the gentleman see the difference between an inanimate railroad and a mangled human soldier?

Mr. DENISON. The President in his statement when he left the country in March called attention to the critical condition of the railroads as the result of the failure of the Senate to pass the railroad appropriation bill; but he did not mention this question, and taking the President's own statement for it, I am sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] and his committee have not been trying to economize at all at the expense of the wounded soldiers of the country, and everyone here knows he has not been doing so. The bill we passed carried \$6,000,000 for vocational education, an amount sufficient to answer all the demands for many months to come, if not for the entire year. Yes, of course there is a difference between railroads and mangled soldiers, but that is entirely irrelevant to the question. Evidently there are some who have thought there was at least a difference in their votes and political influence.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. No; I have not the time. I do not think the committee have been trying to economize at the expense of anyone. They have been simply trying to use good business judgment in the matter of making appropriations. For that I think the committee should be commended.

But the President by his veto of this bill has put the Members of the House in the attitude of not doing their full duty to the wounded soldiers. Everyone knows that is not the case, and to that extent the President has done the Members of Congress an injustice. And, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to let the President get by with any deal of that kind. I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Buchanan]. I am willing to give to the wounded soldiers every dollar that can be wisely expended for their benefit. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas provides several million dollars more for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers than the President has recommended, but I shall vote for it just the same.

I have not said a word in the House recently, in fact, not anything at all, as to what I would do for the wounded soldiers. I do not believe much in talking along that line. I think we would better act rather than talk. Talk is cheap; and making a political football out of the wounded soldier's cause ought to be beneath our dignity. In the arrangement made here in the House since the Republicans came into control, I am allowed one little job at \$1,200 a year as a matter of patronage, and I am bringing a young man here to take that job who lost his right arm at Chateau-Thierry. He is a right-handed man, and he has to learn how to write again with his left hand. I think he will be out here in the document room. You gentlemen of the House who go there will sooner or later see him. He may be a little awkward at first and unable to perform all of his duties as gracefully as others would, but when he comes I bespeak for him that kindly consideration which I am sure all of the Members of the House are willing to give to one whose right arm lies buried under the sod of France—a sacrifice for you and for me. I am going to do that to show my appreciation for the men who have come back from the war wounded, and I think that is about as substantial a way of doing it as either getting up here on the floor of the House and making a long, noisy speech, telling them what a friend you are to the soldiers, or sending a veto message here trying to put the Members of the House, who have been honestly economizing and making appropriations upon a sound business basis, in the attitude of not being willing to do all that ought to be done for the soldiers when that is not the fact. [Applause.]

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand why the President has been subjected to so much criticism on the floor of this House for vetoing the sundry civil appropriation bill when his action is indorsed by the very House itself or will be through the bringing in of an amendment by the Committee on Appropriations of \$6,000,000 more for vocational education than the sundry civil bill carried when it passed. The admission is thereby made by such critics that they did not realize the necessities for caring for this vocational training.

I want to read a few extracts from the statement of Mr. Munroe, vice chairman of the Vocational Board, in his testimony

before the Appropriations Committee, since the veto, as to the amount that is necessary:

Consequently these men to whom we are already obligated for their support and tuition fees will be \$1,400 a year which multiplied by 14,000 is somewhere, as I figure it, about \$18,000,000 required merely for the board, lodging, and tuition of these men. Now, that makes no provision for their medical care. A great many of them, of course, will need very careful care. It makes no provision for their supervision while they are in this course of training and, as you know, gentlemen, we have to very carefully supervise their courses to see that they are carried out as we have planned them to be. It makes no provision for the necessary travel which many of them must take from one place to another. It makes no provision for the administration of a work of this size and there is nothing left absolutely for taking up the problem of the thousands and thousands of other men who have already been surveyed up to the number of 98,000. That is, we have placed under the system 12,000, we are obligated to train about 14,000, that makes 26,000, and in addition to that there are 78,000 men who have been surveyed and whose cases must be followed up as quickly as possible. We have registered a total of 147,000 cases, of which there are 49,000 men who have never been followed up at all and who must be followed up at once. The estimate is that there are probably 60,000 or 70,000 more men still in hospitals and still in the field, and many of those are passably not on our rolls at all.

Consequently, gentlemen, the figures that we have ahead of us, as we have told you repeatedly, are figures that no one could foresee. We are growing every day. The average number of cases that is being acted upon every day by our district offices is 150, which has to be added to the figure I have already given you. No one can foresee the size of this problem during the coming year.

As we have said repeatedly at the hearings before your committee and to Members of both Houses, we take it for granted that when Congress passed this legislation in June, 1918, they proposed that this job should be done not only thoroughly but that it should be done promptly, and that no disabled boy should be kept waiting for more than a reasonable length of time before he should be put into training.

This House can not afford not to give this appropriation for this training, because the board needs it now. We contemplate getting back the last of all of these wounded men, ready to be examined by this board, in a few months, and the strain upon the resources of the Vocational Board will come within that time. It does not behoove Congress to say that this board shall be hampered by a lack of money; that the Congress shall be hesitant about offering these men the facilities they need to become reconstructed.

When the very life of this Nation was at stake and the liberties and safety not only of our own citizens but of those of the allied world were in jeopardy, the American soldiers, sailors, and marines did not hesitate to offer their lives as a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom. Neither they nor those who held them dear refused to have their lives and safety appropriated in defense of civilization and all that mankind cherishes and values highest; and yet it seems that a Republican majority of this House is refusing to appropriate now the dollars that are necessary to give the Americans who suffered wounds in this war the right and opportunity to be restored physically, and to a life of usefulness when peace has come upon us.

It is a strange doctrine of economy—stranger, too, when it is remembered that scarcely eight months ago every dollar and resource of this Nation was pledged to a process of destruction. No one clamored then for false economies, because they realized that it was no time for such action; that this country would have no patience with it, and that the safety of this land and of civilization could not be jeopardized by a failure to appropriate money enough for cannon, ammunition, rifles, battleships, submarines, destroyers, and articles of every kind which either might or could prove useful in winning the war.

But now, when we come to the period of peace and are embarked upon the processes of restoration of our wounded and are endeavoring to provide hospitals, schools and training, and agencies of every kind to build up and re-create the wounded and shattered American soldiers, sailors, and marines, it ill befits a grateful Nation to indulge in practices of economy at the expense of such heroes; and such action will not be regarded by the people of this land as any real economy, but will be taken and looked upon as a badge of humiliation and shame.

It is one thing to try to make a record of economy; it is quite another to overlook in so doing the priceless generosity and sacrifices made by the young manhood of America in the fearful World War.

I believe that the people of the United States will have no sympathy and no patience with plausible excuses and reasons why an adequate appropriation of money for this vocational work was not made. It will not do to take refuge in realms of skepticism and doubt as to the wisdom of providing the Vocational Board now with sufficient funds to give these wounded boys every chance and every facility to be as fully restored as they can be to begin all over again the task of earning an honest living in the field of civil life.

The Nation not only owes them this; it owes them more. The debt can never be paid. The memory of the heroic deeds of these men will never fade from the pages of history, and will

always be enshrined in the hearts of the families, mothers and fathers, wives and children, and their fellow countrymen.

In every one of the millions of homes throughout this land that gave some one of the family to the service of their country there will be preserved with tender and affectionate care the uniforms and symbols of service of those who were enlisted in the service of their country. They will always be precious mementos of the unsurpassed courage and valor of the American soldiers, sailors, and marines who came from the city and from the country, from the farm and from the store, from the school and from the industries; in fact, from every walk of our complex civil life; who loving the arts of peace rather than those of war, yet cheerfully subjected themselves to the severest kind of training and discipline and became the greatest fighters in the world.

Their deeds of supreme bravery, their glorious successes on land and sea, their willingness to endure without complaint the hardships, dangers, and suffering daily encountered, will always constitute a record of which their fellow countrymen will never cease to be proud.

In the crucial and thrilling engagements at St. Mihiel, Chateau-Thierry, and Belleau Wood, where the American soldiers and marines checked for the first time the crushing advance of the German armies and hurled them back with such overwhelming force that the ultimate destruction of the Hun forces was assured, the world and civilization felt for the first time in many weary months its anxiety vanish, and became convinced that right, truth, and justice would prevail.

I wish that time and opportunity were now accorded me to refer in more detail to those glorious and wonderful campaigns in France and Belgium and in other lands, and to make a fuller mention of the indispensable service and memorable triumphs of the Navy in driving the German submarine from the sea and transporting to France in safety over 2,000,000 American soldiers and marines. Their heroic deeds and sacrifices, however, do not have to be recalled to the loved ones of these men or to their countrymen. They are too deeply embedded in the hearts of all to ever be forgotten.

But in treasuring such a record of imperishable fame and glory as these heroes have given America, it would be unworthy beyond expression to forget the needs and welfare of the men who made it.

Every wound and every disability sustained by them in the service of their country is a badge of signal honor and distinction. But in the struggle for existence they are also serious handicaps.

As far as is humanly possible, the Nation must restore them, and restore them now, to a state of health and economic independence. They are not objects of charity, will never be so regarded, and ought not to be. All the money that is needed should be generously appropriated, and appropriated now, when the need is greatest for restoration and training for the various occupations they may be able to follow.

It is not surprising that the members of the Vocational Board should not be able to estimate with absolute certainty the exact amount of money which will be needed in the next 12 months to educate, train, and support the wounded and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines who are entitled to the benefits of the vocational act. When it is considered that 230,074 men were actually disabled by wounds in battle, and that another vast number, yet undetermined, were disabled by disease, exposure, and illness during the war, all of whom are entitled to the benefits of treatment, training, and support under the provisions of this act, it is apparent that it is impossible for the Vocational Board to state with certainty what the precise financial needs of the board will be in order to admit to such training, when they apply, all those who are entitled to receive it.

It is not sufficient to excuse an adequate appropriation now, to urge that a serious deficiency can be taken care of later when it develops.

When the recent amendment to the vocational act was passed by Congress in January it carried an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the board. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. Good] sought, when the bill was before the House, to have that appropriation stricken out upon the ground that an adequate and sufficient amount of \$4,000,000 had already been provided in the sundry civil bill, passed by the House, and then before the Senate. But the House of Representatives refused to agree with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and insisted upon appropriating the additional \$6,000,000 in the vocational act, in addition to the \$4,000,000 carried in the sundry civil bill, making the total appropriation for vocational training amount to \$10,000,000 in all.

When the sundry civil bill went to conference between the House and Senate the conference reported back to Congress a provision increasing the amount for vocational training in the sundry civil bill from four to six million dollars; in that provision, however, was included a clause repealing the \$6,000,000 appropriation carried in the vocational bill. It was due to the erroneous conclusion at that time of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to his representation to the House that \$6,000,000 was all that the Appropriations Committee had found was needed by the Vocational Board. The sundry civil bill, in spite of its urgency, was finally passed.

The President of the United States, however, vetoed the sundry civil bill, because he found that the sum of \$6,000,000 was totally inadequate and the limitations on the administrative features of the vocational bill altogether too severe.

After such veto message was presented to Congress the Appropriations Committee held additional hearings, and in those it was disclosed that the very least amount which the board would need for the next 12 months was \$18,000,000.

Now, while the Appropriations Committee has consented to allow the board to retain the \$6,000,000 appropriated for it in June, but taken from it in the sundry civil bill, and increases such sum by proposing to allow another \$6,000,000, making a total appropriation of \$12,000,000 in all for the fiscal year ending in 1920, yet it now appears from this very recent testimony before the Appropriations Committee that this amount will fall short by \$6,000,000 of the least amount actually needed to pay for the board, lodging, and tuition of the men already in training and whose applications have already been approved.

In other words, the least amount needed now is \$18,000,000. If the Buchanan amendment is adopted, this sum will be provided; but if this amendment is defeated, in my opinion it will mean serious denial to thousands who need this training now more than they will ever need it at any other time and when its benefits will be the greatest.

Let Congress show by its acts as well as by its words that it values beyond price the services and sacrifices which the American soldier, sailor, and marine made for his country, humanity, and the safety and liberties of all, and that it means to deal most generously with those who are wounded and disabled in helping them back to a life of further service and usefulness and to an opportunity to face the world again upon an equal plane with their more fortunate fellow men. The adoption of the Buchanan amendment will be a step in the right direction, but its defeat will, to say the least, indicate rather a spirit of indifference or false economy that the Nation will resent and not forget when it calls upon its public servants for an accounting and an explanation as to how they have discharged the trusts committed to their care. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak upon the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may not be confused as to the status of the appropriation for this service, I want to refer to the statement made while the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] was on the floor. The only estimate made through the Secretary of the Treasury as required by law was the estimate for \$4,000,000 for the whole year. Subsequently a letter was written to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations increasing this to \$6,000,000, and this was subsequently reduced by the board to \$2,500,000. Congress enacted a law amending section 2 of the act, carrying \$6,000,000, so that if there had been no further action by Congress the Vocational Board now would have for the next year \$6,000,000 in addition to the \$2,000,000 appropriated by the original act. The \$2,000,000 was all used before the end of the fiscal year or by that time. Congress by this bill gives \$6,000,000 more, or \$12,000,000, which is \$8,000,000 in excess of the actual estimate of the department.

I want the Members of the House to remember that in order to give the Committee on Appropriations jurisdiction in the orderly way it is necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to send an estimate to the Speaker of the House that so much money is required for a given service. No such additional estimate has been made. Let us not cheapen the soldier, let us not

cheapen ourselves, by voting for an appropriation that has never been estimated for by anyone.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. RUCKER. How much does it cost per soldier for the term of 10 months?

Mr. GOOD. The facts are that while a great deal of loose talk has been going around as to what it is going to cost to rehabilitate a soldier no one knows. Some of them are in training for 10 days and some of them are in training for 4 years. The statement was made that it would cost \$1,400 per year, if they were in that long.

Mr. RUCKER. Has not the gentleman some idea of the number now in training and the number at the door waiting to enter; and if the gentleman has that information, why can not this House multiply the one by the other and make the appropriation, whether it is estimated for or not?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that is a fair question, and you could do it if you knew whether or not they would be there 10 days or—

Mr. RUCKER rose.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield further.

Mr. RUCKER. It would not be used.

Mr. GOOD. The director said on Sunday it would take about six weeks to educate a barber to perform those duties. Now, are you going to give him training for a whole year? He said it would take several months to educate a carpenter. Are you going, now, to give training or the money for training for a whole year and pay that much, when it can not be stated until the service or training is completed? I undertake to say this service ought to be done now. These boys ought to be rehabilitated now and not wait until they are older men. There is no disposition in any way to stop this work. I want to encourage them to give the training as rapidly as possible to these men, but I want to say to the House that we ought to act sanely. When this matter was up before the Committee on Appropriations not a Member objected because the amount was not high enough. No one, so far as I know, was displeased with regard to this amount. It is \$8,000,000 more than the amount estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is \$4,000,000 more than the amount estimated by the President himself, and the only statement that is made here with regard—

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield. The only statement then made was made by Mr. Munroe, who says, "We do not know; our limited experience will not permit us to state whether or not this will cost \$18,000,000 or \$25,000,000, or how much it will cost." All Mr. Munroe asked, so far as I am advised, was that the appropriation of \$4,000,000 be restored. He did not ask even for the \$6,000,000 that the committee has reported. The committee thought that perhaps there might be a recess and it was willing to give at least two-thirds of the maximum guessed at to carry this service well into next year before it would be necessary to take further action. But the Committee on Appropriations so far as I am concerned will be entirely satisfied with whatever action the House may take upon this matter. I know that every Member of the House is interested in the rehabilitation of these boys. They ought to be interested, but at the same time we ought to make our appropriations in a way that when we go before our constituents we can say to them that we did not give more money than was reasonably estimated for the service.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. After the deduction of salaries under this bill which is now under consideration what will be left for the benefit of the soldier boys, roughly speaking?

Mr. GOOD. The amount estimated here in the letter I read to-day is \$3,488,000 for salaries. The limitation put in the bill will effect a saving, as I recall, of about \$100,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Three million dollars for teachers—

Mr. GOOD. No; this is for employees and does not refer to teachers. I do not know to what extent that will reflect in the employment of other persons. I do not know and nobody knows whether it will be necessary to have all of those at present employed. Dr. Prosser stated last February the 1st day of June this part of the work would commence to decline and he would commence to discharge these men in six months. That was the peak load, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] stated when the matter was before the House, but Dr. Prosser stated then that the work would be at its height about the month of June. And so I do not know how long it is going to take. No man knows how long it will take to do the work

or how many of this force that is estimated for here will be on the pay roll all the balance of the year. Here is what he said:

It must be remembered that this is temporary service and that many of these employees will finish their service within the next six months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired by direction of the committee.

The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that be divided. It is in two parts.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to dividing it.

Mr. KREIDER. May it be reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the Clerk to report the first part of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let it all be read, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARD. Can it not all be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean now?

Mr. GARD. Yes; for our information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN as a substitute for the Madden amendment: Amend the bill by striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000"; and add, at the end of the provision, after the word "each," the following provision, to wit: "And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

The CHAIRMAN. The question first to be decided is upon the amount, which I will ask the Clerk to read to the House under the order of the separation.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to discuss that division of the proposed question?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has ended.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to discuss that and two or three other matters incident to it for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first part of the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the figures "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000."

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 96.

Mr. CALDWELL. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I think some gentlemen in the House probably should know what they are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 120, noes 119.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the second part of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. With 120 for and 119 against, if the Chair would vote against it, the amendment would fail? Did the Chair vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not vote on this unless he passes between the tellers. [Applause.] The Clerk will report the second part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the provision, after the word "each," the following provision, to wit:

"And provided further, That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Amendment to what?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment pending. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 104, noes 136.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Goon and Mr. BUCHANAN to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 136, noes 139.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I ask the Clerk to report.

Mr. MADDEN. I move, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to strike out the "\$6,000,000" and make it "\$9,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FESS: After the word "this" strike out the words "or any other."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, in the seventh line from the bottom—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio yield in order to have it read. There is no conflict between us. I think the amendment would be accepted by the committee.

Mr. FESS. I yield for the reading of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: After the word "this" in the proviso, strike out the words "or any other," add a comma and the additional words "and the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act of June 27, 1918."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the proviso or the explanatory phrase or clause given by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] just identifies the law that we want to preserve, and I would have no objection to accepting that explanatory statement in connection with the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to know just what is in the mind of the gentleman in regard to the effect this provision will have that will be cured by the amendment, whichever one is adopted.

Mr. FESS. I will state to the chairman and to the members of the committee that the Smith-Hughes vocational bill, approved June 27, 1918, carries an annual appropriation, when it is at its maximum, of \$7,000,000, to be administered by the Federal Government, in connection with a similar amount to be supplied by the various States; and in order to administer this amount the Vocational Board has divided the United States into 15 vocational districts, over each of which there is a director, and these 15 directors have a salary now fixed at \$3,500 each; and the limitation in the bill we are now acting upon is limited to the rehabilitation of the soldiers, while this goes on to this act and will embarrass 15 regional directors, 2 assistants to the board, and in all 22 members that I do not believe the committee wanted to touch at all.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. The amendment as it is drawn, I understand, will make this provision in the appropriation of \$6,000,000 carried in the bill amending section 2 amenable to the limitation?

Mr. FESS. It will.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I am very much obliged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, would not my substitute be voted on first?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's substitute be voted upon instead of the amendment that I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the substitute will be voted on instead of the original.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the amendment be read first.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: After the word "this" strike out the words "or any other," and after the word "act" insert the words "or the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918," so that as amended the language will read "Provided, That no person (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education) shall be paid by said board out of the appropriation contained in this act or the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918, at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum," etc.

Mr. GOOD. There is no objection to that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I am somewhat confused on that. I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether he is sure that the wording of his explanatory clause will extend to the Smith-Hughes bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it specifically excludes the operation of this proviso from any effect on the original Smith-Hughes Act, and limits this restriction of salary to the act which we are now passing and the act amending section 2.

Mr. FESS. We do not want this limitation to extend to the Smith-Hughes Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I am seeking to exclude by my substitute.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. Is the vote being taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama as a substitute or as an amendment? I understood that the gentleman offered it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. As a substitute. Those in favor of the amendment as now presented will signify it by saying aye.

The substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I think in view of that amendment it is not necessary, unless I have misunderstood the force of the amendment, to retain the words which are in parentheses—

(Except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.)

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. GOOD. I move to strike out the words included in the parentheses—

(Except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: After the word "persons" in the proviso strike out the words in the parentheses—" (except the members of the Federal Board for Vocational Education)." "

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to amend the figures "\$6,000,000" by striking them out and inserting in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a division.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I want recognition for the purpose of offering a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet asking recognition?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send up his amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I move to amend by striking out the word "nine" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. MADDEN. I accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KINCHELOE offers a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN by striking out "\$9,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. KINCHELOE) there were—ayes 116, noes 154.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. Good and Mr. KINCHELOE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 123, noes 148.

Accordingly the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$9,000,000."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 126, noes 151.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 104 ayes and 159 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's motion is dilatory. He has offered amendments in several amounts and they have all been voted down.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the Chair will undertake to sustain any such point of order as that.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair will rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. Are there any other amendments to be offered?

Mr. SABATH. Upon what ground does the Chair sustain the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the ground that it is dilatory. The amount that the gentleman has moved to insert is between the two amounts voted down.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were 163 ayes and 83 noes.

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is possible for the Clerk to read a page of this bill in less than six seconds. I expect the bill to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading in order.

Subsequently:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the Clerk turning over four or five pages of manuscript while he reads one. I have been watching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed in order.

Subsequently:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the pages being read that were turned over. I protest. I want it distinctly understood that as a Member of this House I have rights here. I do not propose to let the Chair sit complacently by and permit that thing to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will call attention to any particular part of the bill that has not been read, the Chair will see that it is read.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not propose to allow the Chairman to permit the Clerk to turn over five or six pages of manuscript without reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," to continue to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof, and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment, and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station, together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act, approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, \$400,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this section for the reason that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill and that there is no legislation passed by this Congress authorizing such an appropriation. I call attention of the Chair to the fact that every Chairman during this Congress has sustained this point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late. No points of order have been reserved on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist that it is not too late. I understand it is the usual custom for some chairman of a committee, or some gentleman, when a bill is reported, to reserve all points of order. I am reliably informed, by an authority that I consider good from a parliamentary standpoint, that it is not necessary and that there is no purpose or reason whatever for reserving points of order, because any Member of the House has the right and privilege to make a point of order upon the conclusion of the reading of any paragraph in the bill. I submit that that is parliamentary law.

I call attention further to the fact that the bill was brought in here under a rule of the committee. It is not printed, and not a Member of the House has an opportunity to know what it contains. If a Member calls for a copy of it, it is impossible to get one. I submit that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that unless there is a reservation under circumstances of this kind a point of order can not be entertained to a part or a section of the bill. It seems to the Chair clear that points of order must be reserved, else it is the duty of the committee to report the bill as it is. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7343, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is considered ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the amendments will be put en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. At what stage of the proceedings will it be in order to move to recommit the bill?

The SPEAKER. After the third reading. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am against the bill, and I desire to make a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not a Member of the House who is against the bill the privilege first of offering a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. The gentleman need not make that inquiry. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Any bill that fails to provide for the disabled soldiers of this country—that does not do it adequately—I am opposed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not answer the question. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: "I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to immediately report the same back to the House with the following amendment to the paragraph providing for vocational rehabilitation: 'First, strike out the figures '\$6,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the figures '\$12,000,000,' and by adding at the end of the paragraph

immediately after the word 'each' the following, to wit: That not more than 18 per cent of all appropriations made by Congress on this subject shall be used for the payment of salaries."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down an amendment will be in order; otherwise not. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—ayes 103, noes 131.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-two Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the previous question was rejected.

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the motion to recommit, that the figures "\$12,000,000" be stricken out and the figures "\$6,500,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has moved the previous question on his amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. He can not make both motions at once, can he?

The SPEAKER. He can not. He makes first one and then the other. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. Is an amendment to the substitute now in order?

The SPEAKER. Not after the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Good amendment may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent that the Good amendment be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is a substitute instead of an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves as a substitute to the motion offered by Mr. BUCHANAN to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the substitute I offered was to strike out \$6,000,000 and put in \$6,500,000. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, what are we voting on?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. CANNON. I want to find out what we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just asked the Clerk to report the amendment. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good offers as a substitute to the motion to recommit by striking out—

Mr. GOOD sent the written amendment to the Clerk's desk. [Cries of "No!"]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa be reduced to writing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see that the House has fair play. The House will be in order and gentlemen will be seated. The Clerk will report the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Iowa. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves as a substitute to the motion to recommit to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500,000."

[Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. The substitute I offered was reduced to writing by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] at my request. I read it from the table instead of sending it to the desk, and if any mention was made— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GOOD. If any mention was made of \$12,000,000 it was an inadvertence. [Cries of "Yes!"]

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said \$6,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Could I withdraw—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I object to a withdrawal of it.

The SPEAKER. In the committee a Member has not a right to change his amendment, but in the House a gentleman has—

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I grant a man has a right to withdraw his amendment or motion in the House before the House has taken action on it, but here the previous question has been ordered and it cuts off any other amendment or right to withdraw the amendment. Here is a motion made to recommit. I know the Speaker is fair, I know the Speaker wants to do right. Now, this is a simple matter. If the gentleman from Iowa got himself in a hole it is not the province of the Speaker to pull him out. [Applause.] The gentleman from Texas offered a motion to recommit, which was clearly in order under the rules of the House. That motion provided that the committee should report the bill back instantaneously appropriating \$12,000,000 for the rehabilitation of indigent soldiers, and the gentleman from Iowa offered a substitute—and the Speaker knows a substitute is nothing in the world but an amendment—now, the gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which is denominated a substitute providing for striking out \$12,000,000 and inserting \$6,500,000. He could not strike out \$6,000,000 because it was not in the motion; \$12,000,000 was in it. It provides for striking out that and puts in \$6,500,000, and on that he demanded the previous question. The House has ordered the previous question. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the gentleman to strike out \$12,000,000 and insert \$6,500,000, and the Speaker had directed the calling of the roll. And certainly under those conditions the gentleman can not now withdraw his amendment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] had offered an amendment to strike out "\$6,000,000" in the bill and insert "\$12,000,000." I have offered a substitute to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000." [Cries of "No, no!"] Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair with the House. What I said in offering the substitute was to strike out "\$12,000,000" and corrected myself by saying "\$6,000,000." And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] and others who were standing near me here heard perfectly what I said and will verify this statement. I had the substitute as prepared by Mr. WALSH lying on my desk while I was reading from it, and that will speak for itself.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KREIDER. To make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to offer a substitute to strike figures out of a bill that are not contained in it? If there is "\$6,000,000" in the bill, the gentleman can not offer a substitute to strike out "\$12,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he must be bound by the record as reported by the Clerk, and if the amendment which is before the House is the amendment as reported by the Clerk—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk reported what the gentleman did not say—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman sent it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BLANTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NOLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is mistaken. The Chair understood that the Clerk reported what was sent up to the desk.

Mr. CRISP. May I respectfully ask the Speaker to have the Reporter read his notes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to have the Reporter read his notes.

Mr. GARNER. That is all right.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. The point of order I make is that it is too late to reconsider, because a roll call has already been ordered on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CALDWELL. The yeas-and-nays vote has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order to move to reconsider.

Mr. NOLAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Is the substitute for a motion to recommit in order unless it is reduced to writing?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized it. The Chair, with the permission of the House, will have the Reporter's notes read.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the Chair answer my parliamentary inquiry? Does not the rule require that the motion to recommit must be reduced to writing?

Mr. CRISP. I never heard of that rule. I wish the gentleman would cite me to it.

The SPEAKER. The House will please preserve order. The Chair recognizes the excitement and the lateness of the hour, but the Chair also recognizes that all men on both sides want exact justice to be done.

The Chair will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and have the Reporter's notes read, and, as he stated before, will abide by them. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the motion to recommit that the figures "\$12,000,000" be stricken out and the figures "\$6,500,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, and on that I demand the previous question.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the motion by which the previous question was ordered.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. This was offered as a substitute. Must not the substitute go to the part that is originally recommitted and can not as a substitute amend the recommitment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. GARNER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. We will never get through here without the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the vote whereby the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WINGO. The yeas and nays have been ordered. It is too late. It is too late to reconsider.

Mr. GARNER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had forgotten that. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WINGO. No. The yeas and nays have been ordered. It is too late for the vote to be reconsidered. The yeas and nays were asked for and sustained.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, you can move to reconsider.

Mr. WINGO. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the roll call was ordered. It is too late.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. Make those men sit down over there. Get the Sergeant at Arms out.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may we have order on the Democratic side? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The question is—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the action by which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CRISP. I would like to make this point of order, to find out if the gentleman voted, ordering the yeas and nays on the previous question.

Mr. GOOD. I did.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that unless he voted with the prevailing side he can not make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GOOD. I remember that I was one of the persons who stood up on this side asking for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get recognition for some time.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is this, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. There is already a point of order pending. You can not make another while that is pending.

Mr. CALDWELL. What is the pending point of order?

The SPEAKER. The point of order pending is the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that the motion to reconsider must have been made by a person who voted on the prevailing side.

Mr. CALDWELL. The point of order I make is that the motion of the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested by some Members that the calling of the roll had begun, and that one or two Members' names had been called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is not correct. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the Chair a moment to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. This has been presented to me—the question was just submitted. I am frank to say I do not know about it, but I am going to submit it to the Speaker: What the House is now dividing on is whether you will reconsider ordering the yeas and nays. This idea has been presented to me, and it is true, that the Constitution fixes how you get the yeas and nays, it providing that one-fifth of those present under the Constitution may demand the yeas and nays; and if you have a majority of the House to decide that you will not have the yeas and nays, you are violating plainly that provision of the Constitution which requires one-fifth to order the yeas and nays.

Now, I know that the Chair wants to do right, and I want to present that thought to the Chair; and on reflection it does not look to me as though we had the right to take this vote, because in that way a majority of the House can absolutely frustrate the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The majority can not deprive the one-fifth of their constitutional right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think that the House has a right to reconsider the motion for the yeas and nays, but if it does so of course immediately the motion is pending, and one-fifth of the House could order the yeas and nays again, so that it seems to the Chair that the question is one of propriety and of usefulness rather than of parliamentary law. The Chair thinks that the motion to reconsider is in order.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHELAN. If that is correct, suppose the House orders the yeas and nays by one-fifth of the Members standing, and suppose a majority reconsider that. Then suppose, as suggested by the Chair, that the one-fifth again order the yeas and nays. Then suppose again by a majority vote the House reconsiders that motion. Can the Chair tell me what the end of the whole proposition would be?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the second motion to reconsider would be a dilatory motion. But the Chair does not see why it is not now in order to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered. It might happen that on reflection the whole House might want to do away with the ordering of the yeas and nays and ought to have an opportunity to do it.

Mr. PHELAN. A parliamentary inquiry. Suppose the House now reconsiders the ordering of the yeas and nays. Will anything be permitted to intervene before somebody has the right again to ask for the yeas and nays in the same manner?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. PHELAN. Then the first thing in order after reconsideration will be another demand for the yeas and nays. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. PHELAN. The first thing in order is the right of somebody to ask for a roll call?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must not take the time of the House by repeating a question which has already been answered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Suppose the House reconsiders the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered. That question is reconsidered. Then does the question come back whether the House will reconsider the motion by which the previous question has been ordered?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair has already stated that the Chair thinks that immediately the question would recur on ordering the yeas and nays, which, under the Constitution, can be ordered by one-fifth.

Mr. GARNER. All right. We have more than one-fifth, and that is enough.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. On a request for the yeas and nays one-fifth of those present rising are enough to order the yeas and nays. On the motion to reconsider if more than one-fifth rise in opposition to reconsidering, is not the motion to reconsider lost?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks these parliamentary questions will be answered by the action of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand the Speaker to say that if the House decides to reconsider the motion by which the yeas and nays were ordered it will not then immediately be in order for a Member to move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, if one-fifth of the House should then demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GOOD. Then I withdraw the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLANTON. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the House shall be in order. Business will be suspended until the House is in order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRISP. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 160, answered "present" 1, not voting 71, as follows:

YEAS—198.

Ackerman	Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Nolan
Anderson	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Ogden
Andrews, Md.	Esch	Kinkaid	Osborne
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nebr.	Klecka	Paige
Bacharach	Fess	Knutson	Parker
Baer	Focht	Kraus	Platt
Barbour	Fordney	Kreider	Radcliffe
Begg	Foster	LaGuardia	Ramsey
Benham	Frear	Lampert	Ramseyer
Boles	French	Langley	Randall, Wis.
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Layton	Reavis
Brooks, Ill.	Garland	Leibach	Reber
Brooks, Pa.	Glynn	Little	Reed, N. Y.
Browning	Good	Luce	Rhodes
Burdick	Goodykoontz	Lutkin	Ricketts
Burke	Gould	Luhning	Riddick
Burroughs	Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Robison, Ky.
Butler	Graham, Ill.	McKenzie	Rodenberg
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Rogers
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rose
Chandler	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rowe
Christopherson	Hamilton	McPherson	Sanders, Ind.
Clason	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrata	Sanders, N. Y.
Cole	Haskell	MacGregor	Sanford
Cooper	Haugen	Madden	Schall
Crago	Hawley	Magee	Scott
Cramton	Hays	Mapes	Sells
Crowther	Hernandez	Merritt	Shreve
Currie, Mich.	Hersey	Michener	Siegel
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	Miller	Sinnot
Dale	Hill	Mondell	Smith, Idaho
Dallinger	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Smith, Ill.
Darrow	Houghton	Moore, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Snell
Dempsey	Husted	Morgan	Snyder
Denison	Hutchinson	Morin	Steensson
Dickinson, Iowa	Ireland	Mott	Stephens, Ohio
Dowell	James	Mudd	Strong, Kans.
Dunbar	Jeffers	Murphy	Strong, Pa.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Dyer	Juul	Newton, Minn.	Sweet
Edmonds	Kearns	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Elliott	Kelley, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.	Temple

Thompson, Ohio	Vaile	Ward	Williams
Tilson	Vare	Wason	Winslow
Timberlake	Vestal	Watson, Pa.	Yates
Tincher	Voigt	Webster	Young, N. Dak.
Tinkham	Volstead	Wheeler	Zihlman
Towner	Walsh	White, Kans.	
Treadway	Walters	White, Me.	

NAYS—160.

Alexander	Dickinson, Mo.	Larsen	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Dominick	Lazaro	Romjue
Aswell	Donovan	Lea, Calif.	Rouse
Ayres	Dooling	Leshner	Rowan
Bankhead	Doremus	Lever	Rubey
Barkley	Doughton	Loneragan	Rucker
Bee	Drane	McAndrews	Sabath
Bell	Dupré	McDuffie	Saunders, Va.
Benson	Eagan	McGlennon	Sears
Black	Ferris	McKeown	Sherwood
Blackmon	Fields	McKiniry	Sisson
Bland, Mo.	Fisher	McLane	Small
Bland, Va.	Fitzgerald	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Blanton	Gallagher	Major	Smithwick
Booher	Gallivan	Mansfield	Steagall
Box	Gandy	Martin	Stedman
Brand	Ganly	Mays	Steele
Briggs	Gard	Mead	Stevenson
Brisson	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Tex.
Buchanan	Garrett	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mooney	Thomas
Caldwell	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, Mo.	Thompson, Okla.
Campbell, Pa.	Harrison	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Candler	Hastings	O'Connell	Upshaw
Cantrill	Hayden	Oldfield	Venable
Carew	Hersman	Oliver	Vinson
Carss	Holland	Olney	Watkins
Carter	Howard	Overstreet	Weaver
Casey	Hudspeth	Padgett	Webb
Clark, Mo.	Humphreys	Park	Welling
Cleary	Igoe	Parrish	Welty
Coady	Jacoway	Pell	Whaley
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Wilson, Pa.
Crisp	Johnston, N. Y.	Ragsdale	Wingo
Cullen	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Davey	Kincheloe	Raker	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Rayburn	Wright
Dent	Lankford	Riordan	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Dewalt

NOT VOTING—71.

Anthony	Freeman	Kettner	Pou
Ashbrook	Fuller, Ill.	Kieess	Purnell
Babka	Goldfogle	King	Rainey, H. T.
Bland, Ind.	Goodall	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.
Britten	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.
Browne	Griest	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Brumbaugh	Griffin	Longworth	Scully
Caraway	Hamill	McArthur	Sims
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	McClintic	Sinclair
Copley	Hicks	McFadden	Slomp
Costello	Huddleston	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Eagle	Hulings	Mason	Stiness
Echols	Hull, Tenn.	Monahan, Wis.	Sullivan
Emerson	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Va.	Wattson, Va.
Evans, Mont.	Jones, Pa.	Neely	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Nev.	Kahn	O'Connor	Wood, Ind.
Fairfield	Kendall	Peters	Woodyard
Flood	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. EVANS of Montana.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. KEISS with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. WOOS of Indiana with Mr. ASHBOOK.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. MANN with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. MONAHAN with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. POU.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Accordingly the House (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 412) to incorporate Near East Relief, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 119), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEHLBACH, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3149) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 120), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 7344) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lewiston, Me., one German cannon or minnerwerfer, and also two 6-inch Newton trench mortar guns, or two 58.2 French trench mortar guns, or two 2.40-millimeter French trench mortar guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7345) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sherman, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7346) to provide for the erection of a public building at Harlan, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7347) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corbin, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 7348) to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of an act approved March 21, 1918, so that said paragraph as amended will authorize and direct the President, acting by and through the Director General of Railroads, to grant reduced rates over railroads under Federal control, one and one-third fare for round trip, to passengers attending conventions, meetings, or congresses of religious, charitable, and other organizations or associations enumerated in said paragraph as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 7349) for the relief of the heirs of the Eastern Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 7350) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved June 25, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 7351) to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 7352) to amend section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 20, Title I, of the act approved April 5, 1918; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7353) to donate to Wahoo, Nebr., one or more obsolete (though not disabled) or captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7354) to give officers or enlisted men who served during the emergency incident to the war with Germany credit for such service in computing their longevity pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7355) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bellefonte, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7356) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clearfield, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7357) to increase the cost of the public building at Dubois, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Allen, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tekonsha, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Galesburg, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Union City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 7404) to repeal section 7 of the act of October 7, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to ratify and confirm, from and including July 1, 1919, obligations incurred pursuant to the terms of certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 177) requesting the United States Food Administration to make an investigation into the present price of flour; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 7362) granting an increase of pension to John Michel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7363) granting a pension to James M. Danner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 7364) granting a pension to John E. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 7365) granting a pension to Henry Humphries; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 7366) granting a pension to Annie M. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 7367) for the relief of Iver Boreson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7368) for the relief of C. D. Pautler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 7370) for the relief of the legal representative of Enoch Ensley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 7371) granting a pension to May Schwartz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANLY: A bill (H. R. 7372) granting a pension to Herman Lazarus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 7373) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 7374) granting a pension to Amanda Burlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7375) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 7376) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7377) granting a pension to Margaret L. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7378) granting a pension to Hattie Lameaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7379) granting an increase of pension to James S. Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7380) granting a pension to Mary J. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 7381) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7382) granting an increase of pension to James L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 7383) granting an increase of pension to James D. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7385) granting a pension to Ellis B. McNeeley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7386) granting a pension to Mary J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) granting an increase of pension to John H. Dunkleburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) granting an increase of pension to George E. Cowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 7389) granting a pension to Anna O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 7390) granting a pension to Samuel Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7391) for the relief of Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7392) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7393) granting an increase of pension to Clement F. S. Aimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7394) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Worick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7395) to correct the military record of John Minster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7396) granting an increase of pension to William Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7397) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 7398) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 7399) granting a pension to Mary Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 7400) granting a pension to Cecil B. Jones and Pauline M. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 7401) granting a pension to John Degan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 7402) granting an increase of pension to James McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7403) granting a pension to Mrs. Ida B. Welker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of 2,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent, protesting the invasion of West Ukraine by the Polish Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition to amend article 10 in league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of the industrial medicine and surgery section of the American Medical Association, urging an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for investigation of causes, modes of transmission, prevention, and cure of influenza, pneumonia, and other diseases, available to July 1, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Adams County, Pa., for repeal of tax on soda, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Burroughs: Telegrams from J. M. E. Badger; J. G. McMullen; W. H. Burns; H. M. Flinn; G. E. Burns; Anna M. Driscoll; H. O. Fanington, secretary Draftmen's Union; P. J. Browne, president Federal Employees' Union; Fred N. Staten, president Central Labor Union, all of Portsmouth, N. H., in opposition to the Good amendment to the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Merrimack Lodge, No. 5, International Order of Good Templars, Manchester, N. H., by Bertha E. Magee, chief templar, and Gertrude E. Holmes, secretary, advocating the prompt enactment at this session of Congress of laws providing for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the

United States Constitution, and also definitely defining "intoxicating liquors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 76 residents and voters of Manchester, N. H., advocating the prompt enactment at this session of Congress of laws providing for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, and also definitely defining "intoxicating liquors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of officers of the One hundred and tenth Infantry and the Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry, protesting against the use of the name Twenty-eighth Division and the insignia thereof by any Regular Army unit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of employees of the Boston Navy Yard, for 44-hour week standard and to grant the Saturday half holiday to its employees during the three summer months; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Pehr G. Holmes, mayor of Worcester, Mass., relative to the claims of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Morton, chairman advisory committee, requesting the State Department to furnish to the United States Senate and to be published for the American people transcripts or copies of all conversations, conferences, negotiations, notes, and other correspondence or intercourse to which Great Britain and the United States have both been parties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition favoring a liberal appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Anti-Saloon League of America, favoring effective legislation for the enforcement of war prohibition and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Wood Post, No. 96, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the Fuller \$50 pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 60 citizens of Mazon, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition opposing continuance of the United States Employment Service as a permanent branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Petition of Castner's Drug Co. and 20 citizens of Long Beach, Miss., protesting against tax on sodas and confectioneries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Carr drug store and 19 citizens of Magee, Miss., protesting against tax on soft drinks, confectioneries, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Memorial of citizens of St. Cloud, Sauk Rapids, and Waite Park, Minn., for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of Federal Employees' Union No. 124, Annapolis, Md., and Federal Employees' Union No. 21, against the Good amendment to the Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Sylvester F. Carman and George A. O'Donnell, of Baltimore, Md., urging the passage of House bill 5418, relating to the printers, pressmen, and bookbinders; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of G. A. Ogg, of Baltimore, Md., for legislation to enforce the constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Paul F. Due and other citizens of Baltimore, Md., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Foster Millburn Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., for legislation to permit alcohol absolutely necessary for medicines, toilet articles, and other bona fide preparations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Roselinda Lester and Mrs. Lena Kolf, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging the passage of the prohibition bill to define intoxicating liquors as all such liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of State Banks, urging the abolition of office of Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of the Empire Lodge of Good Templars, of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of the prohibition-enforcement act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of E. W. Davis and several hundred other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Papers to accompany House bill 7316, granting an extension on United States of America letters patent No. 710997; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the directors of the Wisconsin Game Protective Association, held in La Crosse, Wis., April 2, 1919, recommending appropriation for enforcement of migratory-bird law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, June 30, 1919, recommending that the wireless-ship act be amended to include all seafaring vessels carrying passengers and crews above a certain limit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of J. H. Dulesky and others, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, in the matter of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of the Common Council of Milwaukee, to amend the wireless-ship act; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Alfred Marling, Sam A. Lewisohn, and Charles B. Staats, all of New York, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of James B. Gresham Post, No. 9, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting the reducing, by the board of managers of the national military homes, of the basic pay of all employees so that they do not receive the \$240 given to all Government employees as a bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the California Red Wood Association, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against Senate bills 374 and 692; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Milk Producers' Association, of San Diego County, indorsing Senator Capper's bill legalizing the organization of farmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. M. Henderson, Sacramento, Calif., indorsing amendment to act of October 15, 1914, giving farmers the right to organize; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the California Manufacturers' Association, indorsing daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the City Council of Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Associated Milk Producers of San Francisco, Calif., asking support of amendment to act of October 15, 1914, introduced by Senator Capper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of Walter M. Burke, Simon Gottlieb, James Bailey, and 52 other citizens of Kenosha, Wis., requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of F. K. Barthe, of Tamaqua, Pa., carrying 99 signatures of residents of Schuylkill County, Pa., asking for repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Joseph Schaeffer, of Frackville, Pa., carrying 85 signatures of residents of Schuylkill County, Pa., asking for the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anthony Cernautskas and John A. Kasabes, of Tamaqua, Pa., asking the United States to demand the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory and to give to Lithuania a moral support in her war against Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 340 citizens of Kenton and Campbell Counties, Ky., urging the repeal of tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Washington State Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against pending legislation seeking to reduce the alcoholic content of any medicated liquid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of employees of the Boston Navy Yard, for legislation for the establishment of the 44-hour week as the standard of employment for the employees of the United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Merchant Tailors' Exchange of Philadelphia, asking that skilled laborers be given permission to enter the country, and that no measure be passed which will exclude them; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.